

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fourth Session — Thirteenth Legislature
9th Day

February 23, 1960.

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

NEWSPAPER CORRECTIONS

Mr. A.C. Cameron (Maple Creek): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a heading in 'The Leader-Post' which gives a false interpretation of my remarks . . . (not recorded). The heading was 'Civil Servants Called Arrogant'.

The next paragraph says: "All the way through Departments are full of bureaucracy and civil servants who think they can treat individuals as they see fit, without having to accept or account to anyone." I say that statement is an untruth. It was never uttered in this Legislature by me, and I would ask the reporter of 'The Leader Post' to withdraw that statement, and that they give as much prominence to the withdrawal as they gave to the original article. You would think that heading appeared in 'The Commonwealth' instead of a responsible daily paper. I can imagine the use this will be put to by the C.C.F. with the civil servants. No matter how straight we put the record, a heading like that would discredit everything said in the House, and give it a complete and false interpretation. I want a correction of that heading, which was the opposite of what I said. Such must be done if we are going to have a responsible press reporting in a responsible fashion in this House.

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland): — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have been misquoted in this House as having said that the civil servants who work for this Government are not fit. I did not say that. I used the word 'fitted.' I could read the whole paragraph: "They are not fitted for the job; they are not trained" and I suggested to the Government that they should be trained, as all hon. members will remember. I would like to have that statement withdrawn where I said they were not fit. I think there is a difference here. Maybe I do not know the English language as well as the hon. members of Anglo-Saxon origin, but I understand it means 'properly trained' or 'prepared' to do the kind of job they are expected to do, and I only suggested to the Government at the time that they should be given an opportunity to study and train to get along better with people.

I would like to read what I said. I have the record here, as it was taken down, and I will read the whole paragraph with your permission, Mr. Speaker:

February 23, 1960

“I would suggest to the Minister of Natural Resources that it may be desirable, in my opinion at least, that the northern administrator (Mr. McDonald), who is doing an excellent job, be given more authority. I find as I go from one place to another, that there is just a little too much red tape.”

Then I say this:

“Things are being done that in order to be done we have to go to the Minister’s Department, and that takes time and effort, and I think we should have more co-ordination.”

These are practical suggestions I was making at that time. The Minister would have an easier job, and things would be done much faster. Now I don’t want to be misunderstood in what I said in connection with civil servants — I want to make it very clear that I don’t want to condemn any of the civil servants. I said, “We have some excellent civil servants that do work inside and outside my constituency, but some of them are not fitted to deal with human beings.” I could probably have said ‘trained’, and I said further: “I like the idea (in explaining what I had in mind) of the Department carrying out a school for the instruction of those men who may be excellent administrators in the field, but are not the best of administrators when it comes down to people.” I think it is very, very clear what I said. I take exception, and I think I should receive an apology from the hon. member from Maple Creek (Mr. Cameron).

ANNOUNCEMENT RE WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Labour): — Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this House the fact that this is World Refugee Year, and is being observed by Canada along with 62 other nations across the world. The reason I rise is, that as Minister of Telephones, we have arranged to assist the various committees in all parts of the province in their drive for funds, and arrangements are being made whereby subscribers in any part of the province merely need to go to a telephone, dial long-distance, give his or her name, number and the amount of money they wish to contribute. It will then be added to the bill in the usual way; he will pay it, and the money will be turned over to the Committee. I understand they are quite pleased with the arrangements, and as far as we know it is the first time it has ever been done on this continent. As Minister of Telephones I am pleased that we have a system such as this that will assist them in collecting money for this very worthwhile cause.

NEWSPAPER CORRECTION

Mr. I.C. Nollet (Minister of Agriculture): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I, too have a few corrections I would like to mention. To set the record straight, I noticed that in ‘The Leader-Post’ I have been quoted as saying that, under the Federal plan no payment could be made before December 15 last, and that Premier T.C. Douglas announced Saskatchewan’s participation November 17. This is incorrect. I said December 2nd.

The other one that I think is very bad, and is liable to have some very serious repercussions in Ottawa — someone might die of heart failure: I was quoted as having said that about 11,000 Saskatchewan farmers had received more than \$6 million by January 1. Now, if ‘John’ hears about that, it is just liable to result in a ‘calamity’!

Mr. Speaker, one more correction and that is in connection with the acreage payments themselves — I mentioned that the average per acre payment was \$270, and the average per farm payments were \$300, the added words which are “50 per cent of the maximum”, are not my words at all.

Premier Douglas: — Perhaps the hon. Minister could tell us what the correct figure is.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I said there were 11,000 farmers who had received their cheques by January 31st, and that to date we had received a total of nearly 20,000 applications, and that total payments would probably be very nearly \$6 million. I wanted to make that correction, and I suggest to the press that they please be a little more careful.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to take the opportunity of welcoming a group of public school children from the City of Saskatoon, from the Westmount School, with Mrs. Morris in charge. I think we all are happy to have them here, and hope that they have a good trip and that it will be an informative one.

Mrs. Marjorie Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, I am going to dispense with some of the usual formalities today. I would like, though, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne, and the speakers that have preceded me. There is a great deal in the Speech from the Throne that I would certainly like to comment on, but in the brief time which I have this afternoon I am going to concentrate on just one thing, and that is what I think is the most important announcement in the Speech from the Throne, a prepaid

February 23, 1960

medical care program that is suggested by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, for many years the C.C.F. Party at a national level had been urging a comprehensive, nation-wide health insurance program . . . and in Saskatchewan, where we do have a C.C.F. Government, we have been marching steadily towards that goal, and every step which has been taken, Mr. Speaker, I believe has been a progressive step. It has been very carefully planned, and very well received by the people of this province.

We have been preparing a long time for steps that we are now proposing in the Speech from the Throne, and we have been moving in a very orderly direction. First, it was necessary to increase our hospital bed capacity, and this we have done. We now have the highest per capita hospital bed capacity in Canada, and all across this province, we have now new, modern, well-equipped hospitals. We set up an Air Ambulance scheme so that we could bring people in from remote areas, so that they might receive medical and hospital care, and this, of course, has saved thousands of lives. Our province is now divided into health regions which provide medical centres and in which we have doctors, public health nurses, sanitary officers, where we conduct well-baby clinics, immunization clinics, and so on.

This Government has already had a good deal of experience with administering Government-sponsored medical care programs. We have set up in this province a cancer-care program which cannot be matched anywhere in the Dominion, and I am sure that everyone agrees that this has been a successful program. We can say the same about mental health, where medical and hospital care are provided and where there are no financial barriers as far as the patients are concerned. Again, Saskatchewan leads the field, and I don't need to tell the members of the Legislature how much I welcome the announcement that we are going to set up a small community mental hospital at Yorkton. This is one of the things that has been very close to my heart, and something which I have advocated many times. I think we will find in the future just how important and successful a step this will have turned out to be.

We also have been providing, as fast as the economy of the province will allow, for geriatric centres to look after the care of our senior citizens who need nursing care. We now have 4 geriatric centres and the speech from the throne announces that another one is to be built at Swift Current. Of course, the biggest step in the move to more comprehensive health insurance, was the setting up of the Hospitalization Plan. I don't think anyone will deny what a God-send this has been, not only to the public but to the medical profession.

Now we are ready to start on another — a medical care program which should fill this largest remaining gap in a comprehensive medical care program for our province. In addition to all these things I have mentioned, we have had the experience and the privilege of seeing working right in our

province, in the Swift Current Health Region, an experiment in medical and hospital care, a comprehensive insurance plan. The success of this experiment (if any proof is needed) is the final proof that such a scheme will work, and is definitely in the interests of our people. Of course, we have also had the experience of seeing how comprehensive health plans are carried out in other parts of the world, and we can learn by their successes as well as by their mistakes. I am sure that they all had some difficulties in setting up their plans, and we will have some difficulties in setting up ours. But I do know this, that no country, once having set up a comprehensive medical health plan — would ever dream of doing away with it.

Because there have been some remarks made, rather uncomplimentary to the British medical plan, which, by the way, the Premier has said that we are not going to copy in Saskatchewan. I think we should hear some very authoritative remarks on the British medical plan. I have here a copy of 'The Canadian Doctor' which is a business journal of the medical profession, and it is reporting on a very important conference in Canada between the British Medical Association, the Canadian Medical Association, and the Ontario Medical Association, and this article describes it as one of the most illustrious and representative groups of medical representatives ever assembled anywhere in the continent. I shall quote:

“The session at which the four prominent British medical men presented papers on the National Health Service was well attended and the greatest interest was shown by Canadian doctors, who are wondering what the future holds for them. The presentation, dealing with various phases of the scheme, adequately covered its functioning, and uniform satisfaction was found with its operation. It was not suggested the scheme was yet perfect, certain minor imperfections remaining to be cleared up, but the government always showed itself sympathetic to the medical point of view and there was confidence these difficulties would be ironed out. Both doctors and the public were satisfied with the medical care they were getting and giving today, and neither would, if possible, turn back the clock.

British doctors, it was generally agreed, are doing a more effective job under the National Health Service and the national standard of health is improved. The people have been able to enjoy the benefits of modern medicine more fully since the introduction of the program.

February 23, 1960

Physicians are “less inhibited” about prescribing treatment or operations that might otherwise be prohibited by expense.

Dr. E.A. Gregg, who said he spoke for Britain’s family doctors, who number almost 20,000, declared: “I can honestly say to you that we have kept our full clinical freedom and that we remain free from any “parish pump” local political control, “and we are remarkably little affected even by the vagaries of the national political scene.”

But it was mingling with the hundreds of British delegates, the rank and file of the medical profession in the United Kingdom, that one tended to have his impressions set right on the National Health insurance scheme. So far from regarding themselves as an oppressed body, operating under a system imposed upon them, to which they were opposed and which they found distasteful, they regarded it as a plan into which long deliberation and discussion had entered, one of effectual co-operation between the medical profession and the government, and which was working out to the benefit of both the doctors and the patients they served. Further they saw the inevitability of some such system for Canada.”

Some of the statements made by the opponents of our medical care plan seem to me to be most unreasonable and unfair. I want to refer particularly to an article that appeared in ‘The Leader Post’ on February 9th, under the heading: “Doctors will leave Saskatchewan if the Health Insurance Plan is adopted.” This was written by a man who refused to sign his name, but claimed to be a doctor. Mr. Speaker, I rather question the ethics of a newspaper giving so much space to a person who refuses to sign his name. I have found that with newspapers, the general practise is to refuse to print any statement by a person who refuses to give his name — you must be responsible for your statement, and sign your name. There is something in this article that annoys me very, very much, and I would like to read it:

“If you have a civil service type of medicine, you get general practitioners, with a civil servant-type of mentality, that meant a nine to five job, never going beyond the book in fear of losing your pension and treating the patient as a mass and not as an individual.”

Mr. Speaker, I resent that kind of slur cast on the mentality and integrity of people in the civil service — the suggestion that they are in any way second-class citizens. In my opinion statements of this kind are arrogant,

and quite unworthy of any person who calls himself a member of the medical profession. Some of our most brilliant and efficient, and devoted people are civil servants, and are working for salaries. This is true of our most brilliant scientists, our greatest educators, our teachers, our university professors, engineers, professional people of all kinds. Would anyone suggest that these people are doing a sloppy or inefficient job just because they work for governments, or are perhaps working for a salary?

I would like to state this, that the people who have contributed most to medical science are people in the field of medical research — many of them civil servants, working for salaries. Where could you find a more capable, more dedicated group of doctors than you find working in our mental hospitals, our T.B. sanatoria, our cancer clinics or our University hospital — all our teaching hospitals across this country. To me it is really insulting to suggest that people of this calibre are any less efficient or less conscientious than any doctor in private practise, be he a general practitioner or a specialist.

I also think it is presuming a lot and a very arrogant attitude, by this gentleman not borne out by the facts, that doctors in Canada in private practice are any more conscientious, any more efficient, or doing a better job than doctors in England or Holland or Sweden, or any other country that has long had a comprehensive health plan.

The kind of work a doctor will do will depend on his ability, his initiative and his integrity, rather than on the kind of payment he gets for his services.

Having said this I would like to go on and say that I certainly believe that a doctor should be well paid for his work. I believe also that people in comparable professions, many of whom have completed long and expensive University courses, such as some of our teachers, university professors, scientists and others should be well paid. A medical course is a long hard grind, and even after a doctor gets into practice, his overhead for his office upkeep and equipment is high, and a doctor's life is not an easy life.

A medical course is one of the most expensive University courses, expensive for the doctor and expensive for the public as well, because the fees paid by the medical student do not cover more than a third of the cost of educating a doctor. The rest is paid by you and me, the general public.

I think the critics should keep in mind that not only is the cost of a medical education very heavily subsidized by the state, but that most of the facilities used by a doctor are provided by public purse. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in hospitals in this country;

February 23, 1960

in operating rooms, in fantastically expensive medical equipment of all kinds; skilled nursing care is provided in our hospitals, with nurses taking over much of the work that used to be done by doctors. The facilities of our provincial laboratories are at the service of the doctors. All these things are provided to assist doctors and the public from the public treasury, because they could not possibly do effective work without them. It would be unreasonable and impossible for doctors to provide these expensive services themselves.

Here, Mr. Speaker, you have a good example of the public, recognizing the vital importance of a healthy nation, doing co-operatively something that no individual, or no group of individuals could possibly do for themselves, and all that we are asking in the proposed plan now is that the doctors do the same, and work co-operatively with the public in a scheme that will provide the best possible medical care for all our people in the most efficient and reasonable way. The public already has a big investment in health services. This is as it should be.

The right to a good education, and the right to good health care are two of our basic human rights. The aim of education is to produce a healthy mind; the aim of medical care, a healthy body. These two go hand in hand in hand, and every possible financial barrier should be removed.

Medical care, like education, is an expensive business and should be provided in the most efficient, least expensive way possible, and it should include everyone. Private medical plans serve a very useful purpose, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to be in the category of people who can join in the benefits of one of these plans. Many people are not so fortunate. And of course, as has been pointed out, the administrative costs of these smaller private plans will be higher than a province-wide plan.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that when we do get our plan in operation, we will find, just as we did with the Hospitalization Plan, that this type of plan will benefit not only the general public, but also the medical profession as well. It will give them a chance to do the kind of effective preventative work they have always wanted to do; it should mean they will have their patients consulting them earlier, before serious complications arise, and of course it should mean — I have a good deal more I wanted to say, but the time is getting away on me — it should mean that we can provide incentives to help see that we have a better distribution of doctors. Something we have noticed is that since we have provided comparable salaries in our school units, comparable to those paid in cities, and better living conditions, our teachers are remaining in the rural areas, and that it is much more difficult for the cities now to entice teachers away from rural areas. If we can provide the same kind of incentive for doctors, I think it will make a better distribution.

I believe there is a real and exciting challenge, and a very important challenge for the doctors, as well as the public, in the plan we are proposing, and I am sure it is going to work out both for the benefit of the doctors and for the benefit of the general public. I think it was this kind of vision that was shared by Dr. E. Kirk Lyon, deputy to the Duke of Edinburgh, President of the Canadian Medical Association, in a speech made to physicians and surgeons at the Canadian Medical Association, Bessborough Hotel on October 22nd. Here is what he said: (I am going to conclude with this, Mr. Speaker).

“The doctor urged his audience not to seek to avoid government bureaucracy by creating one of their own. They should not allow their plans to become “tight little insurance companies.” Dr. Lyon said it was impossible not to sense the trend in Canada in health matters. He foresaw increase in government spending for health services, and he said the profession must stand ready to consider all proposals genuinely designed to improve the health of the people. Above all the dignity of the profession must be maintained.”

He concluded by saying he did not think the position medicine carved for itself was being challenged. The medical profession was assured of its place. The challenge was to adapt its thinking to changing conditions as “the shadow of the sundial is at 12 o’clock.”

Mr. Speaker, I do welcome this proposal as I welcome other proposals contained in the Speech from the Throne, and I will support the motion.

Mr. J.W. Horsman (Wilkie): — Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should go through the usual formalities when I rise to speak in this House. I take much pleasure in congratulating those who have taken part in this debate up until now. I also want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the very dignified way in which you have handled the affairs of this House and on your very healthy appearance.

I was very interested to listen to the hon. member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) who just sat down, speaking about health services. I want to correct one little statement she made right now, while it is still fresh in my memory. She spoke about small health service plans, and she said they were very expensive to administer. After 25 years experience with health plans, on a municipal basis, I just want to tell the hon. member this, that in our municipality where we have had health services for a quarter of a century, administration costs absolutely nothing. It is administered by the municipal council at no charge.

February 23, 1960

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Ha! Ha!

Mr. Horsman: — The hon. Attorney General “ha! ha’s!” I wonder what he knows about it!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — You don’t know anything about it, anyway!

Mr. Horsman: — There are a few things that certain people need to know and learn.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — You missed the point there!

Mr. Horsman: — No I didn’t. I am all in favour of a health service plan, and I believe that a plan should be made, adopted and brought into effect that would be of great service to the people of this province, and I think it would be worth it. I think it could be made so that it would suit everyone; it would be satisfactory to the people, and also the medical profession. At least that has been our experience in our own small way, over a quarter of a century. We have never had any trouble with the medical profession; we have never put any pressure on the doctors. Our people have a free choice of doctors — at least ten local doctors, and they are paid on a fee-for-service basis. I don’t see why a plan similar to this could not be worked out on a province-wide basis. I wouldn’t want to see a plan brought into effect under which the doctors would be put on salary, something like a civil servant. I do not think that would be right. I think that people should have a free choice of doctors under any medical plan, and the doctors should have a free choice of patients as well, I think the plan should be financed by a personal contribution from each person, the balance — in my opinion (I am only citing my own opinion here, Mr. Speaker) could be financed by a sales tax.

The reason I say that is this: otherwise you would have to put a tax on property, and I think property taxes are so high now that it would be very unwise to increase them for any purpose. Another thing about sales tax is that everyone has to pay something — even people who pay no other tax. They must pay something under a sales tax, and people travelling through the province, tourists and the like, spend thousands of dollars here during the year and would also make some contribution. But I do think that on a plan as important as this, that is going to cost as much money as this will, that a vote should be taken by the people before the plan is instituted. I think that is all I have to say on that matter.

We have heard something in this House up to now about the amalgamation of the C.C.F. Party with a certain Labour Union. This has been talked up now for quite a while. According to the remarks made in the House last evening by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Davies), the way he spoke I was impressed by his remarks that the party was already in existence. At least he referred to the new party and told us something about his aims and aspirations, so I take it from that that the deal must be pretty well cut and dried. I didn’t expect to see an announcement of that kind made, (although he may not consider it official) until after the election is over, because I am sure that the farmers of this province wouldn’t want very much

of a part in an organization of that kind.

I was somewhat amused last night when the hon. member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) was speaking. I couldn't hear him very well but he did make some quotation from Burns, if I understood it. From here I just couldn't get what he said, but I thought of another quotation from Burns, Mr. Speaker. I know some of Burns' poetry. I am a great admirer of Robert Burns, and I thought of this poem that he wrote one time to a louse — of a louse crawling on a lady's bonnet in church. He thought she was so fine and so handsome, and yet she had no idea that this louse was crawling around on her bonnet. These are a few lines of this poem that go like this:

“Oh for that power the gift tae gie us,
Tae see ourselves as others see us.
It would from many a blunder free us,
That foolish notion.”

Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Touchwood is full of foolish notions. By the way, I remember last year the hon. member for Touchwood got up and said, “Now is the time for the farmers to join with their friends in the Labour Union.” I think I can understand the C.C.F. Party wanting to join with their friends, the Labour Union, but what I cannot understand is, why in the name of conscience the Labour Unions would want to join with any political party. Any party at all.

Mr. Gardiner: — Hail the conquering hero!

Mr. Horsman: — The Labour is in a very strong position today and I cannot see what help it could possibly give them to go into politics. Of course, I think the C.C.F. party are now right at the end of their rope, and they must grasp on to some strong organization or something, to bolster their strength. Whether they will pull this deal off or not, I don't know. I think they are entering the twilights of the Gods. Someone said: “Twilight and evening star, and after that, the dark.”

This often reminds me of the mule that had no pride of ancestry, and no hope of posterity! I wonder how much power the Labour Unions want; whether they think that by joining with a political party, they can have more power than they now have. We know well that there is one labour union along in Canada that, if they go out on strike, they can bring to a standstill the total economy of this nation in just a few days. They can do that. It seems to me that is power enough for any group to have, and I do not believe in group government at any time.

Another thing, farmers are being asked to join this organization. Now, the Labour Unions cannot even agree among themselves. What chance would there be for the farmer? I would advise labour unions to stay out of politics. Of course, they can do what they like; it's none

February 23, 1960

of my business. I would most certainly advise the Farmers' Union in Saskatchewan and other western provinces to stay out of politics, if they want to survive. I would advise them to do that.

I don't think that labour ever has much consideration for farmers at all, not as far as I can see. Labour unions are not formed to help farmers; they are formed to help the men that belong to the labour union, naturally. That is what they have been designed for. The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Stone) called the people in the rural area their "poor relations." I would like tell my hon. friend this, that if it hadn't been for some of these so-called poor relations that he referred to, there never would have been a city where Saskatoon now stands.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Horsman: — And I would tell him further that if the farmers of this country stop producing grains and livestock, and so on for two or three years, the grass would grow up on every street in Saskatoon. I would just like him to think that over.

I just came back a short time ago from British Columbia. While I was there there was a very sad thing happened. Two men barged in to the office of the Secretary of the Engineers in Vancouver, and left him on the floor in a state of collapse. I think they left him for a day. They didn't know who those men were, and as far as I know, they have not yet found out. But there was some fight between the two rival unions. Last summer the same thing happened, when two rival unions there had war (you might call it war) — at least they had a couple of pretty good battles, and pretty near wrecked two beer parlours in downtown Vancouver. This was because they couldn't get along amongst themselves — rivalling as to who was going to bargain for so and so, and so on. If they can't get along amongst themselves, how in the name of heaven are the farmers going to get along with them? That's what I want to know.

Then they show you again how much sympathy the labour unions have for the farmers, you can recall the longshoreman's strike off the west coast a couple of years ago. Right at the height of our shipping season, when our wheat was going out. There was room in the elevators for the wheat, ships were standing in the harbour waiting for cargo, and those men said, "No! We won't load that wheat until we get a raise in pay." Of course they had everyone right over the barrel. They did get a raise after a while, but they held up our wheat at a very important time in the marketing season. That shows what kind of feeling they have for the farmer.

As far as I am concerned, and as far as I know, all labour wants out of the farmer is cheap food. I don't know of any other thing they do want. Of course they are not organized for anything else, except labour, naturally and that is what they are there for. When the longshoremen went on strike they weren't thinking of the farmer. They were thinking

of themselves, naturally. That is why their union was formed, and I don't think there is any place at all in a set-up like that for the farmers.

Another great thing, that labour has is the strike. That is their great weapon. The farmers can't go on strike. Any farmer knows that. If the farmer is milking 25 cows, what is he going to do with his milk? Throw it out on the ground? If he has a bunch of hogs he is trying to sell, is he going to hold them until they are 50 pounds overweight? It is just foolish to say that a farmer can go on strike. They just can't do it. But the great weapon of labour is the strike or the threat of strike. So I think this strong arm thuggery that has been going on in some of the unions, like out there at the coast, is something that should be stopped and if it isn't stopped labour unions are going to lose the sympathy of the entire population. They've got to. I think that's something that should be stopped.

I have a short article about labour unions here, written by a very eminent gentleman, I'll tell you who he is after I read just a part of it, with your permission, Mr. Speaker. The article starts out to say something about the labour trouble in Newfoundland. This is what he said, and I quote:

“The right of labour unions, like the rights of any individual or corporate group of society, are limited rights. They are limited at the point where they violate the rights of others; they are limited at the point where they seek to enforce demands that will do injury to the social economic order on which the entire nation depends for its very life. They are, in short, limited at such points as the principles of democracy and the moral judgments of the general public decide they must be limited, and no responsible labour leader should question the necessity of such limitation. Here again, we are saying that freedom has its price and that price is in terms of discipline, self-control, the spirit of responsibility toward the total social group from which any given section or bodies arise and to which in the long run it owes its very life. We have briefly elaborated the thesis that freedom's most dangerous foe may be members of its own household, to recall a scriptural phrase. We have charged that our cherished freedoms can be lost through their abuse, but those who capitalize on freedom in ways prejudicial to the public good are subverters of democracy and enemies of the people's dreams and hopes. We contend that the only sure defence of our freedom is constant vigilance on the part of the people for the detection of individuals or groups who preach freedom but practice tyranny and who prate about

February 23, 1960

their democratic rights but busy themselves with activities which cynically sneer at those rights. To keep the flags of freedom flying, free men must be resolute and uncompromising in exposing its violations and in bringing judgment upon those who trifle with them in making their own rules and putting selfish interest above the public good as a defiant . . . of their lives.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you who wrote this. This article was written by the Rev. Mr. McDorman. He is Executive Vice President of Acadia University, a member of the Executive of the Canadian Council of Churches, and a former General Secretary of the Baptist Federation of Canada. This publication, as you can see, is a copy of the ‘United Church Observer.’

I am going to talk for moment about something else; something that cannot be considered as under provincial jurisdiction, but something that is everyone’s business, and probably the most important thing that we have in this country. I want to say a few words about trade. I think probably everyone agrees that the prosperity and very life blood of this nation depends upon trade, and we hear a lot about the difficulties the farmers are in. We asked for deficiency payments on grain. We sent 1,000 delegates to Ottawa sometime ago to put pressure on the Government to try and get this money paid over to the farmers. We asked for about \$300 million. I think it is quite clear now that we are not going to get deficiency payments; I think we know that. I think some other means must be found to help the agricultural industry, on a permanent basis. I see no use of adopting some plan that is only temporary in the long-run. Suppose we had got deficiency payments this year. Next year we would be in exactly the same spot, and would have to have deficiency payments again. It would just amount to a subsidy for the rest of the people of Canada. We have a good claim we can put up for that, because we can argue that other industries in Canada are subsidized through the high protective tariffs, and things of that nature. But two wrongs never make a right, and we are starting, I think, at the wrong end of the stick.

I think the way to make the farmers of this country, and the whole of Canada, and the people of Canada more prosperous is to increase trade, and the only way that can be done, Mr. Speaker, is by the reduction of some of our high tariffs. I think that if foreign goods were allowed to circulate in our markets more freely (I don’t say the tariffs should be pulled right off, that nations should be allowed to dump their surpluses in here — not at all) but I think tariffs could be drastically reduced, and foreign goods could flow much more freely into our markets. It would have the effect of reducing prices here, and would have the effect of reducing wages. I have talked to a good many working men, and they tell me that they think they would be just as well off with less wages if the cost of living was lower.

I have no less an authority to back me up on this than one of the greatest C.C.F.'ers that ever lived in Canada. He is still here now. I am going to quote from a speech that he made in Vancouver. The gentleman I speak of is Mr. Harold Winch, M.P. for Vancouver East. He was on a trip around the world last fall with the Parliamentary Association, I believe. He came back to Vancouver about early December, and on December 11, 1959, he made this speech in downtown Vancouver, and I quote:

“A changed Harold Winch warned every level of the Canadian people Thursday that unless they smartened up in their demands for high profits and wages, they are going to lose the markets of the world. It was his first public address since returning last week from a three-month trip around the world, which he described as the finest education he had ever had.

Without sparing the C.C.F. voters who have sent him to the Legislature or Parliament for the last 27 years, he said that everywhere he went on his 22,000 mile journey he was told that Canada, and B.C. in particular, was considered unstable. “They love us,” he said, “as individuals, Canadians have tremendous respect in Commonwealth and foreign countries.”

When I told them I came from B.C., it did not matter what country I was in, they replied, ‘Oh, that is where you have all the strikes.’ He said everywhere he went he learned that imports from Canada and B.C. are being cut off, or drastically reduced. Australia is no longer going to buy our timber. They are going to get it from New Zealand and Malaya. Singapore and Malaya are no longer going to buy our asbestos. The United Kingdom has either already cut off, or has managed to cut off some Canadian imports.

He was speaking to a C.C.F. meeting at Hillcrest Hall, May 28th. With visible emotion he told his mainly C.C.F. audience that he would be “less than honest not to tell them the great lessons I have learned.” He warned employers they will have to think of some profit instead of big profits, or there won’t be any profit at all in two years. He warned labour: ‘Yes, you can maintain your standard, but remember, the rest of the world does not owe you a living.’

February 23, 1960

He warned both provincial and federal governments that they must recognize the great cold war of trade being waged by the Soviet Union. He apologized for being totally frank with his party supporters and the working class, "but I have come home from this trip around the world, determined to get down to work," he said.

He spent most of his time in Australia as a guest with seven Canadian Federal representatives in the British Parliamentary Association. From Australia he went to Indonesia, Singapore, Malaya, Thailand, Pakistan, Iran and the United Kingdom.

Though I am a C.C.F. and am against Imperialism of every kind, I was proud to be British when I compared the results of our colonialism in Singapore and Malaya with Dutch Colonialism in Indonesia. The British left their colonies prepared for the business of democracy. The Dutch, after 350 years of ruling 85 million Indonesians, left nothing but chaos.

Speaking of Canada's standings in the countries he visited, he said this country's aid to Indonesia and the Colombo plan has gained nothing but respect, "but I made a point in inquiring about their attitude to trade. I learned that it was not all to do with race, though it had some bearing. I learned that it is stability they want; stability from us. I know that I could become very popular and come back and speak a lot of nonsense. I know I shall become very unpopular for coming back and speaking a lot of sense, and so brutally frank, but I would be less than honest to say anything but what I am saying tonight, before my own party in my first public address since my return. The people in those countries like us, but they say quite frankly they don't owe us a living."

Government Member: — That's quite a speech.

Mr. Horsman: —

"... and if we, employees, labour and government do not recognize it, we are in for a bitter time for the next few years. There won't be any wages or profits left."

Now, that is one of the Best C.C.F.'ers in Canada that I know of.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — What's wrong with that?

Mr. Horsman: — Well, Here's what the socialist party in Vancouver thought about it — "They came to bury Winch; not to praise him."

Mr. Cameron: — They took a lot of criticism from certain quarters for having said that.

Mr. Horsman: —

“The evils men do live after them;
The good is often interred with their bones.”

“Harold Winch, C.C.F. member for Vancouver, has forgone the right to speak on behalf of the socialists again.”

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Horsman: —

“The C.C.F. meeting was told the former C.C.F. Federal candidate, Hugh Clifford of West Vancouver, told a press meeting of the Stanley Park C.C.F. Club that statements by Mr. Winch, following a trip around the world, proved that he had turned his back on the socialist movement.

Mr. Winch said, following his trip, that unless the Canadian people smarten up in their demands for high profits and wages, they are going to lose the markets of the world, said Mr. Clifford.

The working class must have been very far away indeed from Mr. Winch, as he travelled around the world in a comet jet with all the comforts of a parliamentary tour.”

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Oh, they must be Liberals!

Mr. Horsman: —

“Everything which was said in his return contained the word ‘realization’; it appeared nauseatingly time and again, but the only realization that we socialists can see here is that he speaks for capitalism, and not for us.

By his statements, Harold Winch has forgone the right to ever speak on behalf of socialists again. He cannot speak for two sets of people at the same time.

Mr. Clifford said that he had statistical evidence that could kill Mr. Winch’s argument. His proposals were not even factual. Referring to the topic of his address, ‘The Death of a Socialist’, Mr. Clifford added:

When we talk of deaths and funerals, we frequently conclude with the words, “Rest in Peace.” But we have no tears to waste on this burial. Many of us have been disillusioned by Mr. Winch’s work. Let me at least grant that he spoke honestly. At least he has come out with what he really believes

February 23, 1960

So let us all challenge him at every opportunity when he dares to call himself a socialist again.”

Mr. Speaker, when I drafted that talk, it certainly reminded me of the old saying: “Time and tide wait for no man.” I am right in the same position now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members on your right; my time is running out, and I just want to say a few more words on the Throne Speech.

I think one or two things could have been done by the Provincial Government. I know that many things are not under their jurisdiction, but there are some small things that could have been done, and I was disappointed, when I read the Throne Speech to see that they did not include the privilege of letting farmers use purpose gas in their trucks. There was nothing to indicate that they would refund the \$500 paid by the farmers on the power line, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion.

I wish to so move, seconded by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), the following amendment:

That the following words be added to the Address:

“But this Assembly regrets that Your Honour’s advisors have failed to make provision for repayment to farmers of the share of power line construction paid by farmers under the rural electrification program.”

Premier Douglas: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think we should consider whether or not this proposed amendment is in order. You may not wish to give an immediate ruling on it, but I think the wording should be looked at, where he says: “Your Honour’s advisors have failed to make provision for repayment.”

Mr. Speaker: — Before ruling on that, on the point of order raised by the Premier, I would like to consult with the Clerk.

Mr. Cameron: — That is a good way to take up the air time!

Mr. Speaker: — On advice I would declare the amendment in order.

The debate continuing on the motion and amendment:

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, I would first of all like to take the opportunity of extending my congratulations to all those who have taken part in the debate up to the present time. I cannot agree, of course as most of us can’t with everything that has been said in this debate, but I can assure you that much of, even what I didn’t agree with was, indeed, enjoyable.

Before proceeding with the discussion on some of the points which have been raised in the Speech from the Throne, and dealing as well with the amendment that has been moved by the member for Wilkie, seconded by myself, I would want to bring to the attention of the government one or two matters which concern the constituency which I represent in this House.

Since 1944 to the present date, the Melville Constituency has been represented on two different occasions by members sitting on the government side of this House, and yet, in that period of time very little, if anything, has been done for the people of that particular constituency unless it had reference to the supplying of regular services that are given to any of the other people of this province. Only recently much has been made of the so-called announcement by the candidate of the party across the way in that constituency to the effect that the Minister of Public Works in this province had told him, or guaranteed him, that money would be voted in the budget that is to be presented to this House in a short time, to pay for architectural plans for a public building in the town of Melville. In a question that was asked in this House by myself the Minister gave no such indication whatsoever. He said in his answer that it might be, along with many others, considered by the government in the budget. And this is the answer:

“In the forthcoming budget the Legislature will be asked to provide funds to assess the needs of various urban communities, including Melville, for provincial office buildings, and to prepare architectural plans accordingly.”

And if I know my English, Mr. Speaker, that means that it is going to be considered with many other towns. They might find that the particular Town of Melville needs a building, but there is no guarantee in the answer given by the Minister to this House that architectural plans will be drawn for the town of Melville, or that money will be voted for that purpose in this present session.

This is another case, Mr. Speaker, of the irresponsibility of members of this government, who before the Provincial Treasurer, and Ministers have an opportunity to present plans of their departments, allow private individuals to go about advertising what is going to take place in the budget of this province when it is brought down.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to something that took place in this House back in 1956. Money was voted on that occasion and I will remind the people of the Melville constituency of this. Money was voted on that occasion in the Estimates of the Department of Highways, for reconstruction of No. 22 Highway from the junction of No. 47, to the Town of Lemberg. Since 1956 the orders of this Legislature have never been carried out, the money has never been spent, and that road is in exactly the same condition as it was when the election was held in 1956. I believe here, again, that it shows the

February 23, 1960

irresponsibility of the government which, after voting themselves funds for this purpose, have refused to carry out, not only the expenditure voted by this Legislature, but also the solemn promise made to the people of that constituency by their candidate and officials of this government prior to the last election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt with these two questions that are of particular interest to my constituency, I desire to continue discussing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Hon. J.T. Douglas (Rosetown): — I would ask the hon. member definitely to state what section of the highway . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Oh, I'm not going to bother answering the question.

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, I think if I'm on my feet the hon. member cannot ask a question of me. Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order.

Mr. Gardiner: — Enough of my time has been taken, as far as I am concerned, in this House already by . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. The hon. member asked which part of the highway you were referring to when you said . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I gave the exact portion of the highway, Mr. Speaker, from the junction of No. 47 Highway to the Town of Lemberg. The Minister knows perfectly what stretch of highway I'm speaking of. The Minister will have plenty of time to make his own speech later on.

An Hon. Member: — When you go home.

Mr. Gardiner: — Before beginning the part of my address which deals with the questions of Government actions in this province in the past few years, there have been remarks made in the press stating that parties in this House have not expressed their political philosophy or given the people of this province an opportunity to know what their party stands for. This afternoon, before beginning the main part of my address, I want to give to this House what I feel is the true definition of Liberalism, it is a statement which I believe that any Liberal member in this House, and any Liberal in this province can stand up and be proud of. And this is the definition, Mr. Speaker: Liberalism is the belief in the value of human personalities and a conviction that the source of all progress lies in the free exercise of individual energy.

An Hon. Member: — Hear, Hear.

Mr. Gardiner: — It produces an eagerness to emancipate all individuals or groups so that they may freely exercise their powers insofar as this can be done without injury to others, and it therefore involves a readiness to use the power of the state for the purpose of creating the condition within which individual energy can thrive, of preventing all abuses of power, of affording to every citizen the means of acquiring mastery of his own capacities, and of establishing a real equality of opportunity for all. These aims are compatible with a very active policy of social reorganization involving great enlargement of functions of the state. They are not compatible with socialism which strictly interpreted would banish free individual initiative and responsibility from the economic sphere.

Opposition Members: — Hear, Hear.

Mr. Gardiner: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that as I proceed you will very clearly see that Liberal policies not only in this province but elsewhere in this country, have stayed true in the major instances to the philosophy that I have read to you today, and, in spite of the statements which my friend across the way, the hon. Minister of Social Welfare makes so often in this House about things that he did when he was a boy, I can assure him that if I had the political background of some of my friends across the way I wouldn't bring up examples of what might have taken place in the years gone by, because I know that some of them are not too proud of the political connections they might have had in years gone by when they were young boys or young men.

Government Members: — Liberals especially.

Mr. Gardiner: — Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the main motion that has been presented to us in this House, I would like to make reference for a moment to statements made by the mover of the motion, Mr. Thorson. He and I are much the same age, and with much the same experience, because we entered the House at the same time. He is the youngest member of the Government side of the House and I the youngest member of the Opposition side of the House. In his remarks he referred to the security that the individual should feel that he has when Government is operating the affairs of the country. He spoke of what we might term the sanctity of the individual, the rights of the individual, he spoke of the bill of rights that this government here brought in. He didn't make reference to the bill of rights that is now being discussed, or may be discussed during the present session by our Federal members, but he did speak of the bill of rights of this province.

Now I, for one, believe that our people here in this province and in Canada in general do not need a bill of rights to know how to live, to know how to deal with each other, to know how to live with neighbours, and I believe the greatest proof of this fact is that in the question that was handed down from the minister in reply to a question which asked: "How many prosecutions have taken place under the legislation as established in this province some years ago"? The answer was: "Nil." No prosecutions have taken place in this province under the bill of rights legislation. I am prepared to say this, that after all the talk that we have heard, many

countries across the sea that have very strong bills of rights, which sound very nice, have very few freedoms.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — Hear, hear.

Mr. Gardiner: — We, here in Canada, have enjoyed the freedoms that we have provided for ourselves because of the fact that we are prepared to live together in such a way that we don't require stringent laws of this type to be handed down by governments and I hope that the people of this country will continue to live in such a manner that it will not require the government to move in to have to protect the rights of individuals through bills or through laws.

Now the first point that I want to draw to the attention of the House, this afternoon, is the question of government responsibility. I believe here alone this Government, in presenting the Throne Speech to this Legislature, does not deserve the support of the members who sit either to the right or to the left in this Legislature. We have had many instances since this government came into office, and sometimes other parties have been guilty of the same thing both in Canada and in this province, of passing the buck, passing their responsibilities over onto others. We have in this province an example of paying thousands of dollars for information and advice every year through our Public Accounts: paying economists, paying men who are supposed to know something about the business of this province and the conditions in this province. In spite of that, we find that every two or three years some other group has to be hired and paid money in order to try to tell the Government of this province how it should carry on its business.

I think it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we return to the position where the Government is responsible, not some commission, where the Government has the intelligence and the ability to handle the affairs of this province. We don't have to be paying thousands of dollars out of the taxpayers' money to provide wages to men to draw up fancy documents to tell us what is wrong with conditions in this province. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that if you were to go out and ask some of the reeves in this province, if you were to go out and ask some of the chairmen of school districts, school boards, et cetera, in this province, if you were to go out and ask businessmen, or even private individuals they could tell you just as surely what is wrong with the Government of this province.

Today, just as well as the people from the Stanford Research Organization, just as well as the Royal Commission that reported on conditions in this province some years ago and which has practically just finished its job, that particular job that cost the people of this province a half a million dollars, and then the Government turns around and spends another fifty thousand to bring in some organization from Los Angeles to tell us further what the conditions are here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Now if this isn't a comedy of errors, Mr. Speaker, if this isn't a direct statement by the Government to the people of this province that they haven't any knowledge of what's wrong with conditions here. They have to go through ninety thousand dollars (\$90,000.) worth of experts every year, to advise them. Then they say that that advice isn't good enough, we'll go down and get another group down in the United States to tell us what's wrong in the province. We cannot rely on the information that is given to us by the paid experts in the province. That is what the Premier stated when, in correcting the Leader of the Opposition, he told him that his figures were incorrect. When the Leader stood up and said that he got them from the Economic and Advisory Planning Board there was nobody more embarrassed than the Premier for stating that the figures that his own officials had given the Leader of the Opposition were not correct, and were misleading to the people of this province.

So we have the irresponsibility shown by the fact that thousands of dollars of the money of the people of this province are spent trying to find out what our problems are, what our difficulties are, and then wanting some paid people to tell them how to solve them. If this Government doesn't know how to solve the problems of the people of this province they'd better get out of the way, Mr. Speaker, and make way for some that are prepared to take action and look after the needs of the people of this province.

The general attitude, when we speak of irresponsibility, has been seen in this House since the session started, although it is only a very few days old. The remarks of the member for Cumberland today in trying to wiggle out of a statement which proved very embarrassing to the membership of this House; the throbbing voice of the Minister of Social Welfare standing up the other night and saying: "Oh, I wish you hadn't brought this up. I wish you hadn't brought personalities into this Legislature." I am going to remind the gentleman that when he sat in the House of Commons in Ottawa, his friends down there brought more personalities into discussion, more questions about civil servants and others working for the Government, then did the membership of the party that he represents. So when he says 'personalities shouldn't be brought into these things' he'd better look back on the dirty shirts of his own group before bringing up matters of that type about other political parties.

I can remember back in an election not so very long ago when he and his friends went down and asked a question in the House of Commons about people who were working on behalf of the Government in this province and then came out and sold the lists for 25¢ apiece to get campaign expenses in constituencies in this province. There is the man who does not want us to bring personalities into debate. That's an example of his action and the actions of his party in years gone by in the province of Saskatchewan in the federal field.

Mr. Bentley: — Is the hon. member saying that I sold those lists for two bits apiece?

February 23, 1960

Mr. Gardiner: — I said the C.C.F. party sold them. I said your party sold them, and they did.

Mr. Bentley: — And I want to deny categorically that I never sold any such lists.

Mr. Gardiner: — That's sort of a back-handed way to say they were sold, but he didn't sell them.

Now here is another example of this irresponsibility, Mr. Speaker. During the last session I have had people who have listened to debates and discussion in this Legislature in the past tell me that they never sat through a Legislative Session when they saw the Government so befuddled, when they saw more legislation brought into this House that had to be corrected and sent back for correction to the Legislative officers, that they saw the number of times that the government had to revise their thinking on legislation. It must have been their miscalculations or something when they were writing the legislation, I suppose . . . possibly thinking about the new shot-gun marriage that may be taking place very shortly. That may have been in their minds when they were drawing up the legislation, trying to play all parts if they could, and when they got into the session they found they hadn't played anything very well. Then they had to take it back to their officials in order to have the legislation revised so that it could go through this House.

Then we have the latest examples of Government irresponsibility. We have the example brought into this House the other night when I referred to the Minister of Social Welfare getting up with a throbbing voice and saying that he regretted that personalities had been brought into the discussion in this House. Here is one man as far as we have been told to date, one individual who states that Father Blanchard was unfit in certain ways to carry on his work as head of the Lacerte Co-op. Farm. He hasn't given us the name of any other individual to back up his claim, he hasn't given any statistics to prove his side of the case, he hasn't done any of these things, but the local people of the area that Father Blanchard has worked in for years have come in and urged the government of this province to admit that they had made a mistake. Maybe the government would like to admit that, but the Minister says he's not prepared to admit it.

We find here in the letter which was written on November 16th, by the Minister of Social Welfare, this paragraph:

“The decision to dismiss Father Blanchard was not taken lightly, but was based on a history of events involving the project leading me to believe that Father Blanchard could not give the project the kind of leadership it needs. His inability to rise above personal involvement in day-to-day struggles of the people, the manner in which his opinions”

And he goes on to give those various opinions, but we haven't heard from anyone else.

The local people definitely haven't backed him up in any of the letters that they have written. The former Minister who preceded him in the Department certainly didn't back him up in any of his statements when he was sitting here in the House when the discussion took place. I don't think even the Premier of the Province who is in charge of the Co-operative Department rose in his place in defence of the Minister when he was making this statement. So, I don't know whether . . .

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege . . .

Mr. Speaker: — . . . try sitting still when other people are speaking . . .

Premier Douglas: — I can't agree with the member for Melville. I want to say categorically, now, that I sat in on the discussions between the Minister of Social Welfare, the members of the Lacerte Co-operatives, the local advisory committee, and the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch. I am fully conversant with all that has taken place, and I agree fully with the action taken by the Minister.

Mr. Gardiner: — I think it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier did state his position in this matter, and come to the defense . . .

Premier Douglas: — I have already spoken in this debate and I have no right to take part in the debate again. If the members want to throw this wide open and give me an opportunity to speak . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, the Premier rises to speak so often when others are speaking that we often think he speaks two or three times during a debate in this House. Let's continue with this letter, Mr. Speaker:

“I therefore cannot agree that the decision to dismiss Father Blanchard was a mistake and that the dismissal was an injustice.”

But here's what we find now:

“If I were to comply with your demands that the proposed grants be effective from August 2nd, to enable the Co-operatives to pay Father Blanchard from that date, it would be tantamount to reinstating him.”

Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker. This is the comedy of errors:

“For the reasons outlined above and because he has removed any possibility of establishing a bond of confidence between us through untrue statements” . . .

This is what goes on in the letter he is reported to have given to the press:

February 23, 1960

“which so far as I am aware he has not denied, I cannot consider his reinstatement or take any action which might be construed as reinstatement. However, because of my sincere belief that you are interested in helping this project, to be of help to the Metis people”,

And I want you to listen to this:

“I was, and still am, prepared to make a grant to the Co-operatives to enable them to pay a project leader, the leader to be chosen by the Co-operatives” . . .

and then he says:

“If that appointment were to be Father Blanchard, I am still prepared to accept that decision and to pay the grant. However, it must be borne in mind” . . .

it says, Mr. Speaker:

“that my department will still have the responsibility of assessing the progress of the project insofar as it is concerned with the development of the Metis people and the use of public funds to this end.”

Mr. Speaker, in one voice it says that one man is not capable of carrying on the functions of management of this farm and says that they are withdrawing their support of him as a public servant. In the next voice he says he is still prepared to expend the money of the people of this province . . . Oh, no, he won't admit that he is wrong, but in order to smooth everything over he'll go as far as to admit that they'll be prepared to have the Co-op organization, if they so desire, re-hire Father Blanchard and they will pay sufficiently to have him hired as manager of that farm.

Now what are the facts with regard to the Lacerte farm within the last few years. I have a few figures here that are taken from Public Accounts of the province: In 1953-54 which was the first year in which the larger area of land was included in Public Accounts it cost the people of this province \$18,300 to carry on the operation of that particular farm; in 1954-55, which was the year before Father Blanchard, as far as I can gather from the letters that were written, took over that farm, the cost to the people of this province or what was paid in was \$24,692.14; now in 1955-56, after Father Blanchard took over the operation of this farm and it became what has been called in some the letters 'a true Co-operative', the cost to this province dropped to \$15,185.16; in 1956-57, the following year, the cost dropped to \$9,808.69, in 1957-58 they increased slightly by around \$600.00 over the previous year; then again the next year they dropped down to the lower figure. I would think that the figures of the department concerned, as

given in the Public Accounts of this province . . . disprove the statement of the Minister that this man has been inefficient in the operation of this particular project . . .

Mr. Nollet: — That's pretty cheap.

Mr. Gardiner: — There must be some other reason. I believe that the people of this province who perhaps know the Minister, know some of his political background, can best judge for themselves what the reasons might be for the dismissal of Father Blanchard in this manner and in this way. Here again, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the irresponsibility of this Government which sits across from us. They are the ones who tell us that we shouldn't bring personalities into this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who sit to your right are responsible, as was stated by the member for Maple Creek, for every action of every civil servant in this province; not with the civil servant himself, but the minister of the Government of this province, and the men who sit to your right are the responsible parties in government dealings with the citizens of this province. The only way members of the civil service have any recourse against actions taken against them by ministers of the Government, is through the Legislature of the province, and I think we should, as members and representatives of the people at any time when the citizens of Saskatchewan feel that injustice has been done, bring it down through the highest court right into the Legislative Assembly. That's where we found it.

Opposition Member: — Hear, Hear.

Mr. Gardiner: — This has been the general attitude we've run into in this House, not only during the last four years but with previous members who sat in this House since the Government took office; a 'holier than thou' attitude; an attitude that has been taken by the Premier of this province, and others, since they have been elected to office and before that time. Trying to make out that they are a little bit better than anyone else. I can hear him in his whiney voice say: "We wouldn't do this; we wouldn't do that; why, our hands are clean." That's usually the expression that the Premier uses when he goes into some of his attacks on the Opposition or anyone that he might come into collision with in the discussion of public affairs.

Again, we find, Mr. Speaker, as well as the irresponsibility of the Government, the high-handed tactics of the Government. That's the second reason why I feel that the members of this House cannot support this Government. Why do I say 'high-handed attitude' of this Government? I believe already in the debate that has taken place during the course of discussion on the Speech from the Throne that examples have been given of the attitude taken by this government to local governments in this province during the last few years. The dictatorial attitude of this government at the time of the calling of the Provincial-Local Government conference certainly bore out the fact that this government has accepted the tactics of high-handed dictatorship in the operation of government in this province.

February 23, 1960

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave that particular argument for a moment and discuss for a few minutes the question of industrial expansion and progress in the province of Saskatchewan. We have heard some speakers in this House get up during debate and look back to 1944 with a sneer on their faces and say: "Look at conditions in 1944; look at conditions in Saskatchewan today. I don't know whether hon. members opposite have read the history of the province, how its background or not, but when they talk about progress, Mr. Speaker, do they realize that in the first twenty-four years of the birth of this province from 1904 to 1929, when a Liberal Government was in office, that this province was built from practically a barren piece of land with 90,000 living within its borders to a province of 931,000 people in the space of twenty-four years?"

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, the road system of this province was mapped out. I know hon. members opposite will laugh and hee-haw about that. I suppose they figured that in the first year, 1905, when there were no cars, somebody was going to be out building blacktop roads. I suppose they thought before there was radio, and TV, and many of these other modern conveniences, the Liberal Government should be out putting them into effect as well. But they laugh. You know what happened in 1905, I am sure you realize, Mr. Speaker, not only was the road system in those twenty-four years mapped out and much work done on the roads in spite of statements to the contrary.

The school system in this province was entirely set up, maybe not as all of us would like to have seen it at the present day, under modern conditions, no, but there were schools built in the majority of areas where there were resident citizens living during that period of twenty-four years. Many dollars, many hours of hard work by the citizens went into this work during those years 1905 to 1929 under the leadership of the Liberal Government of those days in building the basic foundation of almost everything that we have today.

The telephone system is another example. The first government telephone system in the Dominion of Canada inaugurated right here in our province of Saskatchewan. I believe the first city in the Dominion of Canada to have the dial service was the City of Regina, and I remember when we moved to Ottawa, I as a boy, in 1935, that dial telephones had not been installed in the City of Ottawa. We went from here to exactly the same system that we had out at our farm at that time and, of course, we still have in many of the rural telephone systems in the province today. But here in Saskatchewan, in Regina, a dial system existed and a government telephone system existed that was built up by the then Liberal Government.

Cities grew; towns grew; buildings were built and many of those buildings exist at this present time. The entire administration system of the government had to be built from the ground up. I know there are people over there who, when they really think back to those days, know that the Liberal Government in 1905 to 1929 did do a tremendous job with the finances that they had at hand in order to carry out the work.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how much money they did have? Well I have the figures here of money spent in those twenty-four years . . . \$218,615,978.00. In the last two years of the present government they have had \$260,000,000.00 to spend and yet people have the courage to stand in this House and indicate over the air and otherwise to the people of the province that nothing was done here prior to 1944.

Mr. Klein: — They should be ashamed of themselves.

Mr. Gardiner: — And, Mr. Speaker, for the next period of years, I have just this to say: From 1929 to 1934 the Liberal government was not in office. I wouldn't for a moment try to claim here that what happened in this province in the next five years was the responsibility of any particular government or matter what political party was in office at that time. It was circumstances that developed, not only here in Canada, here in Saskatchewan, but in many countries in the world who were under the control of socialist governments. Conditions of unemployments and conditions where people in many cases couldn't get enough to eat, not only under private enterprise governments . . . but in many parts of the world where socialist governments were in control as well. This same condition existed here in Saskatchewan and in the Dominion of Canada.

When the Liberal party took over again in 1934 the next five years was an attempt to get out of the years of depression, and then in 1939 the Second World War struck. I believe it is to the credit of the Liberal party at that date that they did everything humanly possible to co-operate and see to it that the war effort could be carried on without the interference of Provincial Government which dropped some of the improvements for their people they would like to have seen carried out so that the war effort of this country could be carried on. All the thanks that the Minister of that Government, men who were in charge of the affairs of this province for so many years, who went through such difficult conditions as they had faced, the only thanks they have received from our friends across the way is laughs for the efforts that they put in on behalf of the people in past years.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that that sort of attitude on the part of the Government is definitely a sign of a dying Administration and of course, Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what it is. Last year in this House I took the time one day when things weren't too exciting, to find out just what the average age of the present government of this province is. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that back in 1957, there were a bunch of old men as far as these people were concerned, running the affairs of the Federal Government in Ottawa. Not only these people, but our conservative friends as well. A bunch of old men that it was time to get rid of. Well, Mr. Speaker, this bunch that's sitting across here average just exactly two years older than the Liberal government in 1957 when it went to the polls.

Therefore, I believe, I have a right to repeat the statement: They're a dying Administration. They're so dead that they even have to go out and try to drag somebody into the grave with them. At least the Liberal

February 23, 1960

party went down with flying colours; they were prepared to fight on the philosophy, on the principles. Also, Mr. Speaker, they were prepared to go to the people on their record whether it meant defeat or victory, but our friends across the way are not prepared to take that chance. Our friends across the way want a shotgun marriage and of course that's because it is a direct necessity that they have this marriage: It's a direct necessity because they think that financially and vote-wise it might prove the solution to the problems of the C.C.F. Government in this province today.

But I don't think that this will work. I don't think that any party that's prepared to compromise its principles in order to bring in a few more votes, in order to bring in a few more dollars, expect to continue the respect of the members of this House or the people of this province. Moreover, I think that the fast move of cabinet ministers and members to announce their resignations took place partly because of the fact that this criticism was beginning to snow-ball. I believe that the Premier thought in this way he could get some likely young recruits for his provincial cabinet, or somebody with some ability that he could put into the cabinet if he was re-elected. However, I think he has been sadly disillusioned in this. He has failed to draw into the midst of his candidates in this province anyone that is too well known, anyone that has done very much that I or anyone else has ever heard of. He has failed to solve his problems of attracting able and competent ministers to his cabinet if they should happen to be re-elected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the remarks of the member for Wilkie about the new political party that he said the member for Moose Jaw had already stated was in formation, or has been formed, in this country. I would just like to say this that last evening — one of the speakers added a third group: he said there would be the farmers, the labourers, the co-operative movement. Now Mr. Speaker, I go into our co-op store at home very frequently, and in spite of the fact that the Premier has stated that the co-operative movement should be in politics, there's still a sign in every co-op store that you go into that the first motto in the co-operative movement is to be neutral in politics, neutral in race, neutral in creed, and yet these friends across the way who call themselves friends of the co-operative movement would even have the co-op climb into the grave with them and go down as well as these other organizations. I believe I can assure the Premier, the cabinet, the members of his Party, that the co-operative movement as a whole has no idea of climbing into the grave with the present Government and going down with them as they will when they face the people in June. And so I say again, that the attempt by members on the Government side, the attempt to draw the co-operative movement in this province into the political sphere is not becoming to men who rise in this House and attempt to claim that they are co-operators in the true sense of the word.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the question of health and welfare, and I was very surprised when the lady member for Regina joined

the Premier who is always making mis-statements about health services in making the kind of statements that have been made by the C.C.F. people around this province ever since they came into office in 1944. No credit was given by the lady member for Regina for the fact that for every dollar the Provincial Government has put into hospital construction the federal Government added another dollar through practically all the years she made reference to. There was no reference made to the people in the local communities, and there wasn't the other day by the Premier. Oh, no, he doesn't actually say it, no, he gets up and says: "We have this and we have that, and we've done this, and we've done that."

Mrs. Cooper: — On a point of order. I believe what I said was that hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent in this country on the provision of hospitals.

Mr. Gardiner: — I believe that anyone standing on the other side should be prepared to give credit, Mr. Speaker, to all the groups sitting here and listening to the Premier the other day when he stood up and said . . . and he said it on TV as well . . . that we have free T.B., mental, cancer treatment, and also free services to some of our pensioners. He said this in opposition to the statement that was made by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that there were no free services. He stood up and made the statement: Oh, he didn't actually say that the C.C.F. had given it, but I don't think there is a doubt in the world but that the majority of the people of this province listening to that broadcast, or listening to the Premier the other day would have taken anything else from the speech except the fact that they were responsible for all these particular things. So, I think we should look a little bit into the history of these movements.

It is a shame that a man who has been Minister of Health would attempt to take some political credit for the fact that there is free T.B. treatment to the people of this province. It is a shame that the Premier would make a statement trying to take credit to himself and his political party for free T.B. service in the Province of Saskatchewan. Today there is much less percentagewise being paid for T.B. services by the Province of Saskatchewan than there was back in the year 1944. In case the Minister of Agriculture isn't aware of that, he can go and get the information, but the majority of the money that is raised for that purpose is raised by the municipalities through land taxation, as it is well known by the people of this province. No credit given . . . take it all onto yourself. Here the people have built up at a time when Liberal Governments were in office the tuberculosis sanatoria that were in this province when the C.C.F. took office in 1944, supplied a free service to the people with the assistance of the Government just the same as is being given today. Is there any credit given to those people in the addresses of either of the members? No credit whatsoever. Take credit onto yourself; don't give any to the people of this province who have worked and striven to give services to the people down through the years.

Opposition Members: — Hear, hear.

Mr. Gardiner: — Then we come to the question of cancer. The Cancer Commission was set up by Conservative Government in this province in the year 1930 to supply diagnostic, and other services, and, of course, the more expensive drugs which were used at that particular time for cancer treatment. But it was the forerunner, it was the basis for the cancer system that we have in this province at the present time. Then we come down to 1944 and I suppose we'll hear them laugh again. Here they are just before an election — they've laughed like that every time, bringing in a medical health plan, and they sat there and laughed every time we have mentioned the proposal, and legislation brought down by a Liberal government in 1944. Well, I think after June the laugh will be on the other side of the face when the electors get through with the Government of this province.

In 1944 a Liberal Government passed a bill providing for the full costs of the cancer clinics, cancer treatment, diagnosis for cancer that exists in the province today. No credit goes to our friends across the way for that particular measure.

Then again, mental hospitals. Here some credit has to be given to the present Government, but in the last year of Liberal Government in 1944 only one-fifth of the total expenditure for mental health, the care of the two mental hospitals . . . which again were built during a Liberal Government by a Liberal Government, the two mental hospitals at North Battleford and Weyburn.

Some of our friends across the way at times sneer about conditions, but let me remind them again that these two hospitals were built at a time when a basis had to be laid for the institutions of this province. They were built at a time when medical science hadn't approached the peak of the present time. Oh, yes, take credit for what the medical scientists do as well. Most of the great improvements that we have in health services today, as was stated by the lady member for Regina, have come from the scientists and the doctors in our midst and not from the governments. I give credit for that reason to the medical men for the research they have carried on which has meant a great deal of relief from suffering to the people of this province. But there is no particular credit coming to the Government of this province for the discoveries which have been made which have alleviated to a great extent the sufferings of the people of this province.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we come down to medical health services. This is another document that some of our friends laughed at at some time. Now, when they're 'coming on their deathbed', as they used to say to the Liberals, they're coming on death repentance with a new medical health services bill. And so I am going to read to them part of the legislation which still exists in much the same form in the legislation of this province today and which was placed on the statute books by the Liberal Government of 1944. Here's what it says . . . it definitely points out the policy of the Liberal party. There's no reason for anyone to be misinformed because the policy and the ideas of the Liberal party are laid down in the legislation in this province. There is no reason for anyone to question what the policy of the Liberal party is with regard to health services. Here is An Act Respecting Health Insurance: "Chapter 76, Statutes of Saskatchewan, 1944". There's been some

remark that the only way this could go into effect was if the Federal Government came in, and I'm going to read the only place where it mentions the Federal Government and if anyone can take that meaning out of it, I'll eat my shirt. Here's what it says after it goes through the explanation of what can be done under this act, it says:

"1. The Lieutenant-Governor may from time to time enter into any agreement which that Government is authorized to make under any statute of Canada, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon.

The benefits to be conferred by this Act shall be such as to provide for the prevention of disease, and for the application of all necessary diagnostic and curative procedures and treatment.

2. The benefits to be conferred by this Act shall be administered under the following headings, namely:

- (a) medical, surgical and obstetrical benefits,
- (b) dental benefits,
- (c) pharmaceutical benefits,
- (d) hospital benefits, and
- (e) nursing benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is a poor reply by the Government to admit that when that legislation was placed on the books in 1944, in spite of the promises made by the Premier during that campaign, surprises me to see that now, 16 years later, the Premier is finally taking the second step in this program that was set out in legislative form and still exists and many of its words and many of its objects remain on the statute books of this province today.

And what administrative reason do we find? There has been some argument that some of us are opposed to health regions. Here is the health region set up right in this Act, placed on the statutes by a Liberal Government and yet we hear statements such as from our friends across the way, that the Liberal party is opposed to health regions. They were set up in 1944, just the same as today.

When I refer to the promises of the Premier, I say that because we have many instances in the election of 1944 in which he states the promises of the C.C.F. party with regard to health insurance. (I want to make this particular point because I think it is apropos at this present time). He said that his party would start immediately to provide hospital dental and mental care irrespective of the ability to pay. That promise was made at Radville, Saskatchewan, June 14, prior to the election of 1944. Now, 16 years later, he's on the second step of making possible health services that a commission was set up to establish in the year 1944. So I say here, Mr. Speaker, the record of the Government of this province is not very strong with regard to health services.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, with the amount of money I mentioned a few moments ago, that this Government has had to spend since they came into office, surely if they actually believed in medical health services, it could have been brought in long before the present day. I don't know whether the Government realizes it or not but their report states, and I think the report is a little conservative in its figures, that 28 percent of the people of this province belong to independent medical schemes. Then as well, on top of that, there are 85 municipalities not including the Swift Current region, and on top of that, many towns in this province, that have medical health services at the present time of one form or another. So I think we would be conservative in saying that over 50 percent of the people of this province are covered in one way or another at the present time, without any move of this Government.

Yes, I want to give credit where credit is due. I'll give credit for the fact that some of our unfortunate people in the province have been provided with medical services since this Government came into office. But that in itself is about the only major change outside of mental health services. There have been changes there, but as I stated, when the previous government went out of office in 1944, much of the total cost of mental health care in this province was being taken care of by the Government of that day.

The hon. lady member for Regina — and I'll give credit here too — spoke about the geriatric centres. I don't know if she realizes, but I do as a young man 20 years ago in this province, there were not nearly as many old people as there are today, and most people here realize that, our province is only a little over 50 years of age. There are bound to be many more people who need such services than there were 25 years ago and I think the lady member for Regina will admit that. I think she will also admit that if that problem had arisen under any Government in this province, they would have received attention with the funds that have been at the disposal of the Government during the last few years.

Therefore I think, Mr. Speaker, in relation to health services in this province, as far as I am concerned, the record of the Liberal party is definitely one that I am not ashamed of. They had a record with regard to health services when they went out of office that was at a higher level than the record of any other Government in the Dominion of Canada. I want to give credit to this Government for having maintained that position and I am glad that they have done so. They have maintained that position since they came into office in 1944, and I am not going to take anything away from them for that, but when it comes to stating, as the Premier has done around this province, that he and his Government have carried out the promises made to the people in 1944, I say that that is a definite mis-statement of fact, because the Premier at that time promised full medical services without charge to the people of this province.

He remembers as well, in the C.C.F. convention in 1943, when he was instructed by the people of his own party, that one thing he must not do

was put on a personal charge for hospitalization when it went into effect. Here is the Government that listens to the voice of the people; here is the Government that, in their C.C.F. sessions last summer, speaking through the Minister of Health and the Premier, “No” when the members at the convention wanted them to make a change in their decision in regard to drug and doctor care for the unfortunate residents of this province, the changes they put into effect during the last session. Their own people asked them to do away with that change and to put it back where it was. According to the press reports, both the Minister of Health and the Premier of this province stood up and told them that they weren’t going to change the decision they had taken during the session of last year.

Premier Douglas: — We are ruled by the majority.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, you weren’t ruled by the majority on that occasion. You just told them you weren’t going to listen to them no matter what they said.

Mr. Speaker, during his address to this House, the Premier, and I am going to thank him for that, took the opportunity to make reference to some of my actions during the Kinistino by-election. I am only sorry that he wasn’t there to preach the sermon, because maybe between the two of us we may have elected a Conservative candidate, if he had come and preached the service and I had done the singing.

There was another evening, Mr. Speaker, when I was with Mr. Douglas, in spirit if not in body, and I was almost there in body and that was the night he spoke at Wakaw. I happened to drive up after the meeting commenced and I sat outside and listened to the remarks at that meeting of the Premier on the loudspeaker. During the course of his remarks at that meeting he didn’t, as I remember, make any reference to old age pensioners, the less fortunate people of this province. He told a few jokes before he went on the air and they were all quite good. I got a laugh at them, even out in the car. Once the speech got on the air he got down to trying to explain what his Government had been doing during the last 16 years and then when the meeting was over somebody asked for questions, and you know they had a fellow from Prince Albert all primed, one of their leading C.C.F. workers, to get up and ask the Premier why they had had to take the action which they did in regard to the old age pensioners of this province.

So the Premier got up, and I could hear him out in the car over the loudspeaker; he was just primping his feathers, getting all ready, it was just the sort of thing he liked, and he said: “You know, that man Gardiner gets up in the House, he pounds his chest for the old age pensioner and he hasn’t got any more concern about the old people of this province than if he flew to the moon”. Then he said: “You know, we don’t make any objection to anything the druggists have done with regard to drug costs although they have proven very high, but we don’t blame the druggists for it, we don’t blame the doctors, they have been very co-operative, but I’ll tell you a story: it is like one of my friends here today”, he said, “Whatever you do don’t repeat this”. “Whatever you do don’t tell anybody about this because they may think

February 23, 1960

I'm saying something against the old age pensioners of this province".

Do you know what the story was? It was about a little lady, and he told them it was from the Department of Social Welfare, maybe it is, but I think if it is, it isn't to the credit of the Premier to go around telling what one old age pensioner or one recipient of social aid is doing in this province, the way he did at that political meeting. He should clear the air in that particular part of the province and let the people know what it is, so that all the old age pensioners don't have to have a slight placed on them.

This was the story: There is a certain spot in Saskatchewan that the Department of Social Welfare began to get large bills from for liniment and every Saturday night someone was purchasing liniment from the drug store. A great big bottle of liniment. These charges continued to come in so they finally thought they had better send out an inspector to see what was going on. So the inspector went out and he went into the drug store and he asked if the druggist thought one individual could use all that liniment. "Well", the druggist said, "I hardly think so, she's a small lady and I don't think she could use that liniment at all, I think it would be too strong for her. You'd better go out and see her and see what the problem is." So the inspector went out to the home of the pensioner, unfortunate person, and he talked to her for a while and then he said, "Say, do you need to use all that liniment that you get every Saturday night from the drug store? Is it necessary that you buy all that liniment?" "Oh," the little old lady said, "that's not for me, my son has a race horse and he uses it on the race horse".

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the type of statement that is made out in the country where he thinks the members of the legislature can't hear him, but fortunately there were some there that day who caught that remark, which I think is a black mark against the pensioners of this province. Although he said, don't accuse me of being against the old age pensioners just because I tell the story; the druggists are co-operating, the doctors are co-operating, but here is this one old lady, she must have built up the cost of the whole drug plan, all by herself. "Don't tell anybody that I said anything about being opposed to these pensioners in this province". And yet he can come into this House, as he did in the debate on the Throne Speech, with a sanctimonious air about everything that he has done, about the fact that nobody else in this province but him and his party over there are concerned with the needs of the people of this province. And that is the type of tomfoolery that goes about this province, with a man in his position telling to the public generally.

I think I would just suggest to the Minister of Social Welfare that he suggest to the Premier that after this when he has access to the files of his department, that he promise him that he will not be telling stories about the pensioners of this province at his political meetings about the country. Maybe if he can get that into the head of the Premier he won't be so apt to use these examples around the country to promote the best instances and get a laugh out of the people at political meetings at the expense of the less fortunate people.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege. I did not refer to the files of the Social Welfare Department. I referred to something which happened when I was Minister of Health, it came under the direct jurisdiction of the Department of Health and in which I was personally involved. It had nothing to do with the Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't care what department he was in charge of. It is even worse when a Minister will expose himself as taking some of the files in the department and going out and using them that way publicly in a political discussion in this province.

]Hon. Mr. Erb: — Your speech wouldn't have been quite so long if you had known the facts.

Mr. Gardiner: — I did know the facts, you didn't. I can assure the Premier in regard to the Kinistino by-election, that if we had spent even half as much money as his party did, we might have been the elected party in that particular by-election.

Now Mr. Speaker, the Premier, as I said, has made statements that his party has fulfilled its election promises. I want to on on by dealing with promises of medical services that were given this party. Here is what we see in the promises published by the C.C.F. prior to the election of 1944, and they have been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition:

“The C.C.F. will therefore set up a complete system of socialized health services, with special emphasis on preventive medicine so that you and every other resident of Saskatchewan will receive adequate surgical, medical, dental and nursing hospital care without charge and let there be no blackout of health.”

Mr. McFarlane: — Fine words.

Mr. Gardiner: — And then we go on to the bottom of the list, and I have here a copy of an address of the Premier with pretty near the same remarks, which I am going to read to you today. First, I would like to show you this one, taken from the Leader-Post, June 2, 1954. I don't believe it was ever denied and it is probably fairly accurate. Even though we have proved today that they are not always accurate I imagine these statements were: “From Land to Profits”, was the title. I don't know what kind of ‘profits’ he was talking about, I think probably it was money, but it may have been some kind of prophecy, but here is that statement:

“T.C. Douglas, C.C.F. Leader, declared in an election campaign speech here Thursday night, that the C.C.F., if given power in the June 15th vote, would shift the basis of taxes from land and consumption to profits of mortgage companies, which he declared, went out of the province.”

Did you ever hear anything like that? And then the Premier gets up in this House and says they have carried out their promise. "We are going to replace taxes on land with taxes on mortgage companies". Well, you know it says something about the mortgage companies going. Well, they went all right, they got out as fast as they could and they never got any money out of them. And so it went right back to the farmer; the farmer had to be the one to pay the money for the social services the government had promised to them in the election.

We find in other articles that appear here, statements by the Premier about how they were going to carry out the plan to get money and I have it down on this list as they appear on "No blackout of Health". The first one is saving considerable money by taking the civil service out of politics. That was going to be the first solution of the problems of the people of this province in getting money to carry out the social services of the C.C.F. government. They were going to get it by taking the civil service out of politics. You know as well as I do, I imagine, you sat in the House and saw what this Government did with regard to the civil service. They not only didn't take them out of politics, they did something that no other Government in the British Commonwealth has done and that is place the civil service right into politics whether it likes it or not, and that is by stating that every civil servant can take an active part in political life in this province. This is the Premier who stood on platforms over this province and made a solemn pledge to the people that if they were elected to office he was going to provide them with the money for social services by taking the civil service right out of politics.

Well, my friend for Notukeu-Willowbunch, I think it was, stated the other day that when the Liberal Government went out of office in 1944, there were less than 3,000 civil servants in this province, and the figure I am going to use now is the more permanent civil servants because that is the comparative figure. In the return that we got this year there are 6,600 on the roster of the Provincial Government at the present time and that does not include the Crown Corporations. That is the comparable figure to what was given by the Government in 1944, somewhat less than 3,000 civil servants in this province. I am afraid, taking those two figures into account, that the Government cannot say that they are saving money by taking the civil service out of politics. First, it hasn't taken them out of politics; secondly, there are well over twice as many, almost three times as many, civil servants placed on the payroll.

Here we have the remarks of one of their own members, in spite of the fact that he said it wasn't quite the way he said it and we didn't put the right light on it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be a complaint, a logical complaint against any Government, when a member on its side of the House gets up and says that they are sending out civil servants unequipped, unfitted, as he finally claimed, although that isn't the way I heard it. In the discussion here he said some civil servants weren't fit to deal with human

beings in this province. I don't think that the member even apologized, when he got up today, for the statement, he just said that it should have been fitted instead of fit. As I said before, there isn't a great deal of difference and I think there is an apology coming from the member and I think that the Premier should see to it that a direct apology is given to the civil servants of this province and if the government hasn't fitted them, as he said, for the tasks that they are to undertake, then they had better get out of the way and let somebody in that can find people that can be fitted to deal with the people of this province in the years to come.

Government Member: — You'd sure like to be over here, wouldn't you?

Mr. Gardiner: — What is the second way they were going to find money? Well, this is the only one they have tried to carry out with any sincerity. This was actually the first one. It usually is with them. Press for federal aid for increased old age pensions, education and health services. That was the first way the C.C.F. was going to provide the money for social services in Saskatchewan, press for more federal aid.

Then there was the old one, that they could and would save money by the elimination of graft and inefficiency in the civil service. We have had the evidence from one of their own members that they are definitely not efficient, that they were lacking in training, they are sending men out who aren't trained to deal with the people of this province. The evidence is right here that there isn't efficiency in the operation of government as admitted by members on your own side of the House.

The next one, clause three: refuse to pay high interest charges currently levied to service the provincial debt. Did you ever see such a joker in a campaign promise? And then have a man stand up before the public in Saskatchewan and say we have carried out the promises that we made to the people in 1944.

Then, here's one that has been referred to in this debate already: "The C.C.F. can obtain revenues from the further development of power distribution". One of their members said it is supposed to be a service at cost. Here in their program they said they are going to make money for the people of this province. The Premier and other members of the government say, "Oh, no, the money is put back into the Power Corporation." Well, it can't be three ways; it's got to be one way. In their program it was going to be to supply social services to the people. One of their members says it isn't, it's supposed to be services at cost and then one of the Cabinet says, "Oh no, we plow that money back into the Corporation." That is the kind of irresponsibility that we have emanating from the Government, and still the Premier goes around saying we have carried out our pledges to the people.

Here's a good one, too. "The C.C.F. Government can obtain . . ." and this is something that is more or less socialistic, this is something you'd expect from a group of socialists who sit on your right, Mr. Speaker. "The C.C.F. Government can obtain revenue from the wholesale distribution of the other staple commodities and machinery, along the lines indicated above" —

February 23, 1960

I jumped over one here, they were also going to distribute petroleum products. That is how they were going to get money to carry on the social services. They were going to put into effect socialism as it was stated in the Regina Manifesto.

I believe I am being quite fair when I say to my friends across the way today, that that promise has not been carried out. Here is one place that maybe had they have been any good at all, they could perhaps gone into business and perhaps done something for the farmers of this province if they really believed in the philosophy they presented to the people. I think myself they were afraid to put it into effect because they knew the failure they would make. They knew that by the time they got through the old bogeyman of big business and big profits would disappear like air, and that the people of this province would find out that a C.C.F. Administration had proved to them that there weren't the profits available in all these businesses, that they were just big 'straw men' that they had put up to be knocked down.

So we find that with regard to this distribution they haven't done anything; they haven't made one cent in this manner in order to provide social services. Then, of course, they say that the C.C.F. can raise money by the development of natural resources. Well I think that any natural resources that have been developed since they came into office have been developed in spite of the Government that sits across the way and cannot be counted. The Premier and others stand up and boast about the development of uranium in the Province. Don't they realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Liberal Government had much more to do with the development of uranium in the Province of Saskatchewan than the present Government to your right ever had since they have been in office. So, here again, they can't take any credit for the position they find themselves in today with regard to the development of natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular document, the civil service came in last and I am not going to make reference to it again. But here were promises. The Premier said: "Show me any promises that I haven't carried out," and then he also said: "Show me one person that has been evicted from his farm or had a mortgage foreclosed and I will resign." Well, he's already had to resign so many times that he's forgotten he made the promise and he has never resigned at all. I am sure the people will take care of that at the coming election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the question of population, many figures have been used, but I think there is one other figure that can be used to good avail and that is the percentage of the population of Canada represented by the people of the Province of Saskatchewan. Back in 1929, the date I used not too long ago, very close to 9 per cent of the total people in the Dominion of Canada lived here in the borders of our province. In 1941 there was a drop, which we all realize, because of war conditions, to 7.79 per cent of the population living in the province. But let us continue: after the war, in the years when the other provinces began their gains, in 1951 it dropped to 5.94 percent of the population of Canada and in 1956 it continued to go down to

5.48 percent. Yet the speakers on the Government side will get up and say that the progress in the drop in population has been halted and has decreased not according to the percentage comparison with the rest of the Dominion of Canada. Now we've reached the point where, if redistribution takes place in Ottawa, the influence and prestige of this province in the House of Commons, when normal considerations are taken into account, will drop from a total of 17 members to a possible 13 members when redistribution has been completed.

There is only one government that is responsible for that. They've been here 16 years and they have had plenty of time to do something about the conditions in this province to alleviate the falling off of the population and to bring new industry to the province, so I say this year when redistribution comes up, I can see right now the pained expression on the face of the one member we have from Saskatchewan, Mr. Hazen Argue, if they suggest dropping our number of members by four. I can just see the pained expression on Mr. Argue if they try to do that. He'll try to bring up all kinds of arguments to show that if they will only give us another 15 or 20 years we may be able to get ourselves back up. If we only have this socialist Government in long enough, we should be able to get some place with regard to population but I don't know, Mr. Speaker, they've had 16 years and I don't think any one of us is prepared to see another 16 like it in comparison to the rest of this country.

The Stanford Report made it quite evident, as far as I can see, that we in Saskatchewan have more advantages with regard to gaining industries, with regard to mineral production, than probably any other part of western Canada, but it hasn't taken place. They didn't give any answer to that. Oh no, when they are being paid \$50,000 would expect them to give an answer? Would you expect them to give a real answer?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — That's not a fair statement.

Mr. Gardiner: — It is a fair statement because of the fact that there can be only one reason. Everything else is favourable. They said so. They say so in their report. Nothing unfavourable as far as I could see, strictly speaking about the province of Saskatchewan for industry and mineral production. Nothing except the fact that our neighbouring province got ahead of us in many fields, and the fact that there aren't enough markets to look after the rest if we go into the same fields with them. That is about the only fact that stands against the province of Saskatchewan today, and, of course, that fact is because of the Government sitting across the way in this Legislature.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, when we get down to the consideration of the C.C.F. Government we have to look if only for a moment at the development of the so-called Crown Corporations. Of course we all realize, at least we would hope, that some of these organizations would make money and it appears that they have. But if we were to take the 16 years

February 23, 1960

this government has been in office and take the total of the profits, even at their own figures, there wouldn't be enough in the profits that have been made by the Crown Corporations even to make a dent in the medical and social welfare costs for the people of this province. As a matter of fact, if they had taken the same dollars invested in each of our Crown Corporations and used it for some of these services, then our people might have realized during the past 16 years some of the promises that this Government has failed to fulfill since its election in 1944.

And so, Mr. Speaker, for the various reasons that I have mentioned here, I want for a moment, before taking my seat to make special reference to the position the agricultural industry finds itself in in this province at the present time. The Motion, the amendment to the Speech from the Throne, definitely makes reference to one of the promises made by the Liberal party to the people of this province for the coming election and that is, of course, giving the right to the people of this province to use purple gas in their trucks.

Being in the business that I am, I have seen examples of individuals who have been arrested because of the fact they have been found to have purple gas in their trucks. This is not a very happy occasion, of course, when people find themselves in this position. Someone in this debate that this Government has nothing to do with farm prices. Well, I am going to dispute that fact. Provincial Governments have the control over prices of anything in this country. The main controlling voice and influence is the Provincial Government. We have a Milk Control Board in this province at the present time, not run by the Federal Government, but by the Provincial Government. This Government, if it so desired, could control the price of any product in the province of Saskatchewan. It could control the price of its sale, or the price at which people had to buy it within the boundaries of this province. When they state that they haven't any responsibility for the position the farmers find themselves in, they are presenting an untruth. We find the Minister of Agriculture sitting over there, who knows better . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Will the hon. member permit a question:

Would the honourable member say that we should be prepared to stop agricultural products from other provinces coming into this province?

Mr. Gardiner: — Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Minister of Agriculture still makes no difference as to the legal rights of the provinces. When you say that you haven't any responsibility for prices you are stating a mistruth, no matter what the other answer is. The provinces have complete control over the price of goods within their own boundaries. The Minister of Agriculture knows that. Any time that the Government is displeased at the prices that are being paid to farmers they have the right and they have the responsibility, if they so feel that he is not being treated right, they have the responsibility, and the money, and the backing of the people to provide something to the farmers to alleviate the condition he finds himself in.

For some years, fortunately we had a Liberal Government in Ottawa, and the Minister here the other day paid them a compliment. He said never before have we been asked, I guess since he was in office, by the Federal Government to share in a scheme and pay out money such as we have in this particular instance. That is what he said in his address.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — That was no compliment.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, it may not have been any compliment, but I took it as one whether he meant it as one or not, Mr. Speaker. Because the fact was that when we had a Liberal Government they took the position that they had a job to do, and within the boundaries of the constitution of this Government, and within the policies and beliefs of their party, they were going to try to carry out in the best way possible, actions which would alleviate conditions existing here in Western Canada and in other parts of Canada.

When the P.F.A.A. Act was brought in, one of the statements that was made with regard to it was that it was set up in that manner because of the Constitution of the Dominion of Canada and they suggested that the province should come along and take part in the scheme. Well our Government here has been in office for 16 years. They have done nothing to back up the actions of the Federal Government to alleviate conditions existing on the farms of this province. They have taken no action until they were forced to in this present emergency, when the Conservative Government said, "You put up some dollars or you're not going to get any from us." I think in some ways they were smart in doing that . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Are you in favour of these payments?

Mr. Gardiner: — What payments?

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The acreage payments?

Mr. Gardiner: — I'm in favour of any payment. I'm in favour of payment in dollars to the farmers in this province, no matter how it is.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gardiner: — The Minister of Agriculture got so excited yesterday he forgot to take me into camp. I got quite a kick out of that, when he told everybody, "Boy, a little later on I'm going to look after that member for Melville." He said, "I'm going to get up and tear him to pieces." And then he ignored me altogether. I was hoping he would bring it up, Mr. Speaker, then he ignored me altogether. I was hoping he would bring it up, Mr. Speaker, because the particular instance he was going to refer to was a meeting held by a Pool committee north of my town at which I was not present. A meeting which was held and I was later informed of the Resolution that was passed at that meeting, asking that the Federal Government immediately allow interest free cash advances to be paid to the farmers of this province on the grain that

February 23, 1960

was lying out on the ground. I believe that I said in my statement, that if sufficient cash were made available in this way, when spring came along and we could see the actual conditions existing at that time, then the Government of this province and the Government of Canada would be in a position to take the proper action, after all consideration. At the same time money should be made available to the farmers at a time when they were facing Christmas, and the farmer and his family would like to have some money before that particular event.

I did not say in that statement that I was opposed to any payment to the farmers of this province and I never have been. I'll make that quite clear at this time and I can assure the Minister that he wouldn't have embarrassed me a bit by bringing it up, because of the fact that the Mover of the Resolution was a man who stood at the C.C.F. nominating convention for the constituency not too many months ago. I can assure him that it came from a very good source, the Resolution that was moved at that particular meeting and I would have been glad to have answered that at this present session.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — They wouldn't have had any payment until next spring, if you had helped.

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I think maybe he will give us some help. They would have had plenty of help and use of the cash under the cash advance system. A lot more than they have at present and they would have also had the full assistance next spring when the conditions could be seen all over this province. Either through the P.F.A.A. or the present payments could be made at that time, and I think the Minister of Agriculture will agree.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — The Federal Government . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — Well, I know that, but that wasn't before Christmas, Mr. Nollet. That wasn't at the time when the farmers were asking for a little bit of cash in their pockets and they wanted some consideration. They didn't want to wait until February or March for their money, because that would be seeding time again and just about time for payments on the wheat that is supposed to be coming out. They'll have some cash, but in December they didn't have any and a lot of them were worried whether their families were going to be able to enjoy Christmas. The Minister smiles about it, but I feel that it was a serious situation and I think that he actually feels that, too. I also think that if cash advances had been made on the grain on the ground it would have been the best solution for the moment and these other payments could finally have been decided on and the province maybe have done more than they have done at the present time to alleviate the position the farmers find themselves in, particularly in the northern part of the province.

Mr. Speaker, there is another way in which the provincial government can assist farmers. We have Crown Corporations and, as I suggested a few moments

ago, there is one way in which Crown Corporations could have made money, if they had so desired during the last few years. For example, in the next town to me was a rink that was built not too many years ago by the people of that community. Grain has been stored in it ever since, and today they've got a rink that is paid for completely and they are collecting somewhere in the neighbourhood of 12 or 13 thousand dollars every year and they hardly know what to do with it. Now, I am quite certain that if the Government of this province had had the interests of the primary producers and the farmers of Saskatchewan at heart, that maybe if they had set up a corporation to build shelter for grain in this province, that they could not only have supplied a service to the farmer and permitted him to dispose of more grain, but they could as well have had many buildings that could have been put to good use by the people of this province when the day comes when our surplus of wheat is gone and those buildings could have been used to good purpose. I am quite sure that in that business even this Government could not have lost money. I am quite certain of that, even with the inability in most instances to make money unless they can force everybody to make use of what they are operating like the Timber Board in the north.

They have talked about big organizations in the past, about big business and that is a big business today because it is a monopoly, a socialist monopoly, the Timber Board in this province and here they say they can't set prices. We know they set the prices of timber to the producer and they also set the prices they are going to be paid by the persons who use the lumber. The Federal Government doesn't do that, it's the Provincial Government that sets the price when it is sold to the consumer or sold to the person who is going to sell it to the consumer, and they also set the price they are going to pay for the timber from the bush that they receive from the operator. Where could you get anything that is more monopolistic than that? Where could you get anything that was controlled more viciously or dictatorially, there are some countries in the world where you might, but not very many.

Here again, we find that this government has continued to say, we can't do anything for the farmers, we're hamstrung, we haven't got the right. The federal government should look after these problems. We find in this province that the Federal Government has given a great deal of assistance toward, for instance, cold storage plants for the storage of farm produce. We find that the egg producers of Saskatchewan have to send most of their produce to the provinces of Alberta and Manitoba in order to store it. We find that our producers of other primary products have no service given to them for taking care of their primary produce. Is it any wonder that with a Government that has refused to take unto itself any responsibility for the greatest group of the people of this province, is it any wonder that our rural population in Saskatchewan today finds itself in the price-cost squeeze that they are in at the present time.

Nothing that this Government has done, Mr. Speaker, since they came into office, has alleviated the cost price squeeze that exists in the province

February 23, 1960

at the present time. I think for that reason and for the other reasons that I have given since the commencement of my address here, that I can assure you that when the vote is held on the amendment to the speech from the Throne, moved by my friend for Souris-Estevan, and seconded by the member for Kinistino in very fine fashion, when the amendment to that Motion comes up to allow the farmers of this province to use purple gas in their trucks and to give some assistance from this Legislature in a rural province in that way, of course I am going to vote for the amendment.

Going back, I am sorry, I didn't have it before me, but one's just about as good as another anyway, they're both good planks in the platform, but giving back the payment made by the farmers for the construction of power, that is the Motion that was moved by the member for Wilkie and that is the Motion which I am supporting. Of course it will mean even more money so I am pleased to second that Motion, more than I would be the other because it will mean even more money to the farmers of the province. If the amendment is carried it will mean somewhere, whether it is spread over a number of years or not, in the neighbourhood of some \$30 million that will go back into the pockets of the farm people of this province, money that rightly should never have been paid, for the installation of power that they were to be given. Equal opportunity. The Mover of the Speech from the Throne mentions something about equal opportunity. Well, I don't know if he feels that the farmers during the past few years have had equal opportunity from various of the Crown Corporations.

There are one or two other items now that we have got to the Power Corporation that I wish to mention. When it comes down to individuals and personalities, here again, the member for Souris-Estevan mentioned about the care the government has taken with regard to individual people and particularly the less fortunate. What has been the case with regard to our Saskatchewan Power Corporation? Today, I think there is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 30,000 farms that have not had electrical power installed. They say there are about 60,000 that have so there must be about 30,000 that haven't. I am quite prepared to say that most of those 30,000 are people who couldn't afford to pay \$500, people who are less fortunate. Then we find another, at least 10,000 who have had to take a loan and have had to pay back the account of the Power Corporation in three yearly payments and here we find that they have to pay 5 percent interest, I believe the Minister will agree with me, as well as paying the \$500 they have to pay 5 percent interest on the money to the Power Corporation. So we find here that the Power Corporation has certainly been looking after the less fortunate people of this province that were mentioned by the Mover of the Speech from the Throne. I can refer again, and I am going to, on this occasion, because of some of the examples that have been mentioned in this debate.

I brought this matter up a year or two ago and to my knowledge I don't think the matter has been rectified to this day. I also brought up another matter last summer and I haven't heard yet whether the lady in question received power after I wrote to the Minister in August. He sent

the enquiry on the Power Corporation and since then I have had no reply as to whether anything was done about that particular case or not. I can assure the Minister that he has a much bigger staff than I have to answer his mail, but I don't want to be writing correspondence every two or three days about one matter and I would appreciate it if he would check his files and try to get some answer as to whether the lady in the Kinistino seat — or maybe it was after the election and maybe nothing was done, but this lady, who I happened to visit in the Kinistino constituency, lived just on the edge of, I wouldn't even call it a hamlet, but it was an area that the people within it were given free power in comparison to what the farmer had to pay for farm installation. She was on one quarter of land and owned 40 acres of that particular quarter. One of the other residents on that quarter that happened to live a little closer to the village, received his power free of charge and she was denied power by the Power Corporation free of charge and was, of course, asked to pay the regular farm fee. She was on Mothers' Allowance or a pension of some type and I was in her home, the home unfortunately was a very poor one. Here is a case the member for Souris-Estevan would hold up as an object lesson of how this humanity first Government looks after those who are not able to take care of themselves.

In the town of Melville, the case I brought up a year or two ago, the case of an old age pension couple who applied for power and the answer of the Power Corporation was that somebody told them that if they gave power to this man in his home that he would probably light a gas lamp anyway so they wouldn't install the power and they wouldn't accept the recommendation of the town to include his home in the area where power could be given free. And that is the type of policy that the member for Souris-Estevan would ask us, as members of this Legislature, to vote for the Speech from the Throne.

I want to explain this last piece quite carefully. The Speech from the Throne is a document. It is a vote either for or against the government of the day. It is not a vote for the statements in the Speech from the Throne. It is not considered as a vote against any measure, all those are going to be considered by the members as the debate progresses. It is either a vote of want of confidence in the government or a vote of confidence. After the examples that have been given by the members of the Opposition; after the statements of the senior and junior member for Saskatoon, I am not sure which he is, and the member for Cumberland, showing up the conditions which exist at their two points, I remember the member for Saskatoon thanking the government for everything that they had done and then he said he only wished they would bring some industry to the City of Saskatoon, right after the Premier had finished stating how well things were looking and how much industry they were bringing to Saskatchewan, the junior member for Saskatoon gets up and says, "Well, we've done pretty well, but I only wish you would bring some industry to the City of Saskatoon, the second biggest city in the province of Saskatchewan."

Now, with the examples given to us by the members opposite and the many examples of irresponsibility that have been given by members on this side

of the House, I am quite certain that none of us, Mr. Speaker, could vote confidence in a Government that has failed to carry out the promises under which it was elected in 1944, and a Government which has refused to give the type of government and provide the type of government which the people of this province require at the present time. I will support the amendment to the Speech from the Throne and I will vote against the Motion.

Hon. C.M. Fines (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the others in congratulating the mover and seconder on the excellent job they did in presenting the Speech from the Throne. I should also like to congratulate those who have taken part in the debate up until this time. I have no intention of trying to follow the example of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner) in his rantings and ravings this afternoon. I would like to say how much I enjoyed the address of the hon. member for Souris-Estevan. This was one of the finest addresses we have ever had the pleasure of listening to in this Legislature, and my prediction is that we are going to hear a great deal more in the future of this young man.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) on the excellent job he did in his maiden address in this House. He has already proven that he is going to be a very worthy successor for that greatly beloved former member, our friend, the late Henry Begrand. I would like also to congratulate him on the winning of the by-election. I had the pleasure of being in the constituency for two or three days. I think the victory was particularly impressive because of the fact that the percentage of vote was increased over that of such a popular member as the late Mr. Begrand.

During the by-election I had the pleasure of spending a few days in the same hotel as my hon. friend from Saltcoats (Mr. Loptson). I want at this time to correct a statement that has been going around Yorkton. At a convention there last summer I pointed out that I had spent a few days in the same hotel as the hon. member for Saltcoats. They have the story going around that I slept with the hon. member. I just want to make it perfectly clear that this was not true — that we at least had a wall between us.

We have heard a great deal this afternoon about the end of the C.C.F. Government. The hon. member for Melville on four occasions claimed that the Liberals would win the next election. There is, of course, nothing new in this. I have here a copy of a 1956 Leader-Post, when the Leader of the Opposition claimed that the C.C.F. would lose the election. He also, a year ago, accused the C.C.F. of being a caretaker government. The new Leader of the Liberal Party stated that the future of socialism would depend on the results in Kinistino. It would appear, however, that the Liberals will never learn. The Star-Phoenix on June 5, 1959, in an editorial assessing the by-election results, stated:

“The Kinistino by-election result holds some pressing danger signals for both the Liberals and Progressive Conservatives. First of these is that criticism, and much of it pretty badly shop-worn, is not nearly enough and that voters want positive proposals. For some years now the Liberals have been saying that the province should pay the cost of rural power installation and have failed to get obvious support on this scheme.”

Mr. Speaker, as it is now 5:30, I shall continue my remarks after recess.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then recessed at 5:30 o'clock p.m.

The House resumed at 7:30 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, before recess for dinner, I congratulated the Mover and Seconder and referred to certain statements made by the hon. member for Melville. I pointed out that this afternoon, on at least four occasions, he expressed confidence that the Liberals will win the next election, and I also pointed out that this was nothing new. The Leader of the Opposition had made a similar prediction in the 1956 when he accused the C.C.F. of being a ‘caretaker’ government and the new Leader of the Liberal party had stated that the future of socialism would depend on the results of the Kinistino by-election. I had then just taken a moment to point out that that very splendid daily newspaper in Saskatoon which was quoted at some length, so glowingly, yesterday afternoon by the hon. member for Maple Creek made certain comments in assessing the by-election results, and pointed out that the chief thing the Liberals could learn was that its criticisms were pretty badly shop-worn. It is not nearly enough, the voters want concrete proposals. And then I pointed out that it also goes on to say that for some years now the Liberals have been saying that the Province should pay the cost of rural power installation and it failed to get obvious support on this theme. Then, too, the same editorial, at least the same paper, the ‘Star Phoenix’ in an editorial, September 28, in outlining the Liberal farm policy, pointed out that the farm policy had several very obvious weaknesses and it said that the same resolution would reduce costs by refunding capital costs of farm electrification.

“In the 1956 general election the Liberals tried to project that promise into a big farm issue, but Saskatchewan voters rejected it. There has been little evidence in the years since, that the farmers would vote for the proposal in 1960. They have asked, quite recently, where would a Provincial Government get the huge sum of money involved to fulfill that promise.”

That, Mr. Speaker, is from that very fine paper the 'Star Phoenix'. And yet we are asked this afternoon in this fantasia to express regret that your honour's advisors have failed to make provision for repayment to farmers of their share of power line construction on the rural electrification program.

Mr. Speaker, after the farmers on three successive occasions, in two general elections and the by-election in Kinistino, have had an opportunity of expressing their opinion, they have rejected the Liberal party which used this as one of the main planks in the campaign. Why then should we . . .

Mrs. Mary J. Batten (Humboldt): — Is it the reasoning of the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the farmers have to vote to defeat the C.C.F. before they get the \$500 back?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, when people go to vote at the polls they vote on the issues in the campaign. The Liberal party has used, as one of their major issues, this question of the refund. They have tried to bribe the farmers of this province on two successive elections and have failed.

Mr. A.H. McDonald (Leader of the Opposition): — It's their money. You stole it from them.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I would like now to express my sincere sympathy to the Leader of the Opposition on retiring from the leadership. I have learned to admire him and like him. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can say that he is a friend of mine, and I am sorry for the circumstances which made it necessary for him to leave the leadership. I think the Liberal party is going to be poorer because of his giving up the leadership of this party.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we heard one speaker, the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. J.W. Horsman) telling us about how certain statements have been made by Mr. Winch, and then he quoted another person, unknown to me, to point out that Mr. Winch's statement was incorrect. May I say that even in the Liberal party we find people who differ. For instance, the new leader of the Liberal party is very critical of labour organizations and the organized labour movement. He has made some very serious attacks on it and the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. A.C. Cameron) felt constrained to get up to say that Saskatchewan wants no part of anti-labour policies or anti-labour legislation. He also, on the same occasion said the Liberal party would get nowhere by attacking the C.C.F. as socialists or attacking the Crown Corporations. Then, later on, he said that one candidate for the leadership was presuming to set Liberal policies and announcing this as policies. This candidate speaks for himself and not for the rank and file. He also said if the campaign gets rough then I'll string along, I can get as rough as the next chap but I think the leadership campaign should be above board.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, even members of the Liberal party at times have disagreements on what should be the policy line. I notice that even my hon. friend for Melville (Mr. J.W. Gardiner) had some disagreement. He thought he had leadership claims; his chief claim was that he thought he was better qualified and, after all, I suppose that is his privilege. Unfortunately he couldn't get the majority at his convention to agree. In fact, it was only a very small majority that agreed with the hon. member. Now, again, the hon. member disagrees with at least two of the other candidates. He disagreed, for example, with both Mr. Thatcher and Mr. Cameron. They had accepted the nomination only under the pressure of parties known or unknown. I wonder who these parties were who were exerting the pressure. The hon. member for Melville believed the claims of having succumbed to pressure indicated that both Thatcher and Cameron have organizations behind them, but he would seek the leadership because he can best lead those believing in the Liberal issues. Mr. Speaker, there you have right within the Liberal Party between the members, who are sitting in this House this afternoon, a difference of opinion and yet we have your hon. friend for Wilkie quoting this afternoon, trying to show, because two British Columbia members have differences of opinion there must be vital differences in the policies of the C.C.F.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things pointed out by the 'Star Phoenix' in assessing the by-election was this question of the refund of the money but then it said, "on the silly side, they have criticized the Natural History Museum in Regina, this kind of criticism has not attracted support."

We know, of course, year after year the museum has been attacked by Liberal speakers, who have been very critical. For instance, the hon. member for Pelly (Mr. J.R. Barrie) and I am quoting from the 'Leader-Post', June 2, 1959, report of a meeting at St. Brieux on a Sunday night. It said:

"The one million dollar museum, which cost \$107,000 to operate and maintain last year, was a pure luxury at this particular time. There are many other things that the money could have been used for to better advantage than this building to house a bunch of stuffed gophers, crows, coyotes, and so on."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is opposed to this. A reading of the Stanford Report indicates that this is one of the main tourist attractions in the province. I want to make the statement here, Mr. Speaker, that this museum will not cost the people of Saskatchewan a single five-cent piece and that it will be paid for by gasoline tax and other revenues which will come to this Province from tourists. And yet, here we have our hon. friend objecting to it.

This is not the only thing he objects to, and I am sure the civil servants in this province will be interested in this statement:

"The civil servants which were 2,000 in 1944 now exceeded 6,500, and this did not include employees of

February 23, 1960

Crown Corporations. A Liberal government could cut the civil service in half and still give a better service. Too large a proportion of every government dollar went into administration.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about this; a lot of nonsense, I think, is being talked about the civil service size. First of all, it was not 2,000 as the member stated, the official figure indicated that it was 2,761 on the 30th of June, 1944, and it is now, as he indicated, 6,500. I would like to point out, however, that where there has been a substantial increase in the civil service it has been because of the increase in the volume of work being undertaken. For example, we now have a Geriatric Centre in Melfort, we have a Geriatric Centre in Saskatoon, we have a Geriatric Centre in Regina. Do the hon. members expect that we can put these buildings up without a staff to operate them.

Government Member: — There’s one in Melfort.

Mr. Gardiner: — Don’t forget that one.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — One in Melfort, I’m sorry.

Do they expect us to do that? Yes, it would indicate they do. At the Battleford Mental Hospital and the Weyburn Mental Hospital, we all know, in 1944 the employees were working 72 hours a week, six days a week, 12 hours a day. Certainly it requires more staff if you are going to get away from the abominable conditions that were existing at that time.

I would like to point out, though, something that appeared the other day on the Order Paper when a question was asked for the number of employees of the Liquor Board. Well, March 31, 1944, there were 281, today there are 275, notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Speaker, that last year there was \$42 million in business compared with \$12 million in 1944. Three and a half times the volume of business with less staff, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that there was more money being wasted in 1943-1944 with the staff that there was in existence then, than there is today with several times as many. I think that is a very good example.

Take in my own department, the Treasury Department, in 1944 we had a total staff of 61; today we have a total staff of 56. Five people less in the Treasury Department than there were in 1944 and yet we have a capital and revenue budget today of some \$135 million, four times the volume of work being done with less employees than there were in 1944.

Mr. McDonald: — What about the Budget Bureau?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — And yet my friends have the nerve to talk about inefficiency. They wouldn’t know inefficiency if they met it in broad daylight, Mr. Speaker.

The . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, the number of employees in the Power Corporation has gone up from 175 to 2,393. Is there anyone who doesn't feel a real sense of pride in that? We should all be very proud of the fact that the Power Corporation has been developed to that extent, a corporation that is doing so much to develop this province.

The hon. member for Melville this afternoon was talking about the administration, a dying administration, of old men.

Opposition Member: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, I want to tell him that there is still a lot of life left in them yet. He says the candidates are not too well known. Well, I would like to tell him that when the votes are counted after the next election he will find in the constituency of Melville there is a candidate that is well known and a candidate that will be very favourably known. He'll find that out! I want to make a prediction now, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member will not be back in this House because of the wonderful candidate that we have in Melville constituency. One can go all over the province and find them; whether you go to Redberry or whether you go to Pelly or whether you go to Gravelbourg or whether you go to Saltcoats or Arm River; they are all excellent candidates.

Mr. Gardiner: — They're all supermen!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I never have seen a finer selection of candidates.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Melville, this afternoon, talked a great deal on what has been done by previous governments in providing for health services. He pointed to the health insurance, the Liberal Cabinet prepared and put on the books. Well, it is true, it was put on the books, just like the larger units of administration were put on the books. The larger units of administration had been put on the books several years before, but what happened? Nothing happened, and nothing was going to happen. Not one plan had been made to pay for the cancer care.

Hon. Mr. Erb (Minister of Health): — Ask him who opposed it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Yes, who opposed it? That's right. The hon. member knows very well, the answer to that.

Mr. Gardiner: — On a question of privilege. I would like to say that if the hon. Minister thinks I have that much influence the prophecy of the Provincial Treasurer isn't going to come true.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made some reference to population. He pointed out that because of this government our population had gone down and if we were elected we were going to lose some 4 members in the next redistribution. Now, of course, we all know that the population for the redistribution is the population based on the years ending in one, 1931, 1951 and 1961 and so on. In 1931 to 1941 the population of

Saskatchewan went down very sharply. We note, too, that that continued through until about 1946. The highest population we had in this province was in 1936 when it was some 931,000. It dropped, up to 1946, to 832,000. Mr. Speaker, those were the years when we had a different Administration, not a C.C.F. Administration, with the exception of the last two years. In 1951 our population had dropped to the extent where we should have lost two more members of parliament, but because of a change that was made in the Redistribution Act, we were able to get 17 members. Now, I have no reason to believe that the same thing would be done again. It could be done again, but I would point out that at one time we had 21 members in Parliament. We are now down to 17 and, based on the 1951 census, we should have been down to 15. So, it is quite true that we are in danger of losing some. But surely this government which has stopped this loss of population cannot accept the responsibility.

Messrs. McDonald and Gardiner: — No. no.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, we all heard this afternoon that we should have a few more Crown Corporations. I thought this was very interesting to hear. The hon. member pointed out that he knew of a skating rink, I don't know whether he was thinking of the one in Southey.

Mr. Gardiner: — That's a long way from my home.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . where they have been using a skating rink for the storage of grain. He points out that this has been done for several years and now they have enough money to pay for the skating rink and they don't know what to do with the rest of the money. And he suggested that what we should do is to go into building granaries, (I don't know why we shouldn't be building skating rinks). We should be building storage bins to store the wheat and we would make all kinds of money. Does the hon. member not know that five years ago the Wheat Board stopped that and refused to allow any more of these storage bins to be built outside, away from the elevators. Does he not know . . .

Mr. Gardiner: — On a point of privilege. I said you could have done that. You were in office 11 years. You're too late now.

Mr. Danielson: — How about tanneries and shoe factories?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — In other words, the hon. member believes that the Provincial Government should have bailed out the previous Liberal Government that didn't have the courage to go out and do something to help the farmers with their storage problems.

Mr. Gardiner: — They built more than any other outfit.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We heard the other day a great deal from the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. D.T. McFarlane) speaking about

relief seed grain. He gave us quite a story of what had been done by previous Liberal Administrations. Well, I want to tell you tonight, that this was one of the sad, sad stories which faced this Government in 1944. The hon. member tried to give the Federal Government the credit for this. In 1944 we went to the people with a positive platform on the seed grain. At that time we stated that we would adjust the seeding advance for 1938 by the Government accepting 50 percent of the principal as full repayment.

We all know that in 1937 disaster struck the province and left the farmers without seed for the next year. Every year since 1938 the farm organizations, the rural municipal organizations, the United Farmers of Canada, were demanding that the seed loan be paid on a 50-50 basis, half by themselves as individuals and half by the underwriting of the Governments, acting on behalf of the people. The farmers were prepared to carry the major share of the burden. They were not asking that they should be relieved of all responsibility. Yet, successive Liberal Governments refused to do anything about it. They said to go to the banks and renew the loans, year after year. So, when we were elected in 1944, one of the first things we were asked to do was to enter into an agreement to renew these loans with the banks. This we refused to do. We knew, by doing this, all we would be doing would be piling up more interest and leaving this problem more difficult to solve in future years. So we went to the Federal Government and asked them to share with us 50 percent of the cost and collect the other half from the farmers. The Federal Government didn't do this, and because we refused to sign the Federal Government paid the banks off in full and then immediately proceeded to deduct the payments from our subsidy cheques.

The Provincial Government felt that this was a matter that should be shared by all people of Canada, and, of course, the cry of repudiation swept across this country from one end to the other by the Liberal party. In the first place, the Province of Saskatchewan was not the debtor. This was a debt owing by the individual farmers to the banks, guaranteed in the first place by the Municipalities and the Province and guaranteed in the second place by the Dominion. In the second place, the Government of Saskatchewan, undertook to give treasury bills to the Dominion Government in the same form exactly as the treasury bills that had been given by the previous administration for relief. We also agreed that we would pay 50 percent of the principal in cash as it was collected, at the rate of not less than \$2 million a year. This, of course, was refused and we sent on the treasury bills anyway to Ottawa thinking that they might take them, but despite the fact this was what they had accepted from previous Liberal Governments down through the years they refused to do this. Immediately, then, we had to get into negotiation with the Federal Government to get the money they had kept back from us, and insisted that we pay this off within a period of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, \$16,671,000 was the amount of this owing when this Government took office. The farmers of Saskatchewan, or the municipalities acting on their behalf, have paid up one half of all this, the Provincial

February 23, 1960

Government has paid the other half and has paid the interest, and where the farmer had paid it off within the period we refunded the interest to them as well. Here we have a Provincial Government which had accepted the responsibility for a full 50 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the only thing we have done. In 1935, 1936, 1937 seed grain advances, amounting in all to some \$21,800,000 were cancelled, and the 1938 seed grain, the total amount that was cancelled, including the interest, was \$9,900,000. Then there were other relief accounts, seed grain accounts, going way back to 1917, amounting to \$7,381,000. These three items alone amounted to \$39 million and \$187,000.

But these were not the only direct debts that we cancelled. In November, 1944, we cancelled our share of the direct relief advances which were advanced to those in need during the 1930's amounting in all to \$33 million. There, Mr. Speaker, is a total of \$72,187,000 cancelled by the Provincial Government for which we took the full responsibility, relieving the municipalities of a burden of \$39,187,000 which meant a great deal in additional revenue for them. When you consider all the other things that we did at that time for these municipalities, I think one of the reasons today that the municipalities are practically out of debt and why they are in the excellent financial position they are, in spite of the inflation which has taken place in this country, is due no doubt to the action which was taken in those years.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says that the Dominion Government did this for us. What happened then? Well, for many years after Saskatchewan received back its natural resources there was a dispute as to how much was owed by the Dominion to the Province for the use of those resources in the years when the Dominion was unrightfully using them. There were two members of the commission who said \$5 million was the amount; another commissioner, Mr. Justice Bigelow, said the amount that he felt was owing was some \$55 million. We went to Ottawa to arrange a settlement, and Ottawa wouldn't budge, wouldn't budge an inch. We had this treasury bill question, we had this relief, seed grain and all these other things, so we made a package deal with the Dominion Government. They didn't give us \$36 million in cash. What they did was say that they were prepared to pay 50 percent of certain of these outstanding treasury bills, totalling some \$36 million. We, in turn, accepted the sum of \$8 million, which was the original \$5 million plus the interest and agreed to the acceptance of the \$36 million in full payment of the Dominion liability to the province for the natural resources. So, there was \$44 million of this amount which we were credited with by the Dominion Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out at this time that these treasury bills normally bore an interest rate of 3 percent and we had \$91 million of them staring us in the face in 1944. There was almost \$3 million a year in interest payments. Now it is true that the Province never had to pay it because the Commission that had been established had made a temporary suggestion that in lieu of increased subsidy the Dominion should pay the

interest on these treasury bills, and so that amount was never paid. Strictly speaking, in determining the amount of interest that was being paid in 1944 we really should be adding this \$2,700,000 because it was a subsidy from Ottawa in lieu of payment of this amount.

Mr. Speaker, by the settlement of this relief and seed grain, as I indicated before, the rural municipalities were able to improve their financial positions very greatly. I think, even more important, the people of this province, many of whom had no hope for the future, many of whom were despondent over the fact that they had these seed grain liens and relief claims attached to their land, when they saw a Government come along in 1944, 1945 and 1946, to wipe this indebtedness off, it gave our farmers a hope for the future. It was one of the things that enabled them to hold their heads up high, but I am not proud of the fact that a member of this House will get up and say that the Provincial Government did nothing to help the farmers and that the only help they got from a government was from the Federal Government. I think the statements made by the member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley were such a distortion of the facts that he should get busy and read and try to learn something about what really did take place.

Mr. McFarlane: — We'll bring you out some more if you want.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the fact we are spending so much more money than we were before, and that we are not doing enough to help education, we are not doing enough to help the municipalities. I should like to remind the hon. members of this House that today, when we make comparisons, we are not talking about the same dollars we were back in 1944. When we talk, for example, about a budget of \$133 million compared with a budget of \$30 million, or \$24 million as it was in 1943-44, we are talking of a dollar today that is worth 50 cents.

There has been a great deal of inflation talk in the paper this last year — I want to congratulate the 'Leader-Post' for bringing this question up, the only thing I am sorry about is that it took them so long to realize that there was inflation, to realize that the value of our dollar had been slipping. It was not until the Conservatives were elected a couple of years ago, that they began to realize that there was inflation in Canada.

To go on, Mr. Speaker, what is the truth about this whole question? Well, in 1949 the index was fixed at 100. Using this same index, (you see we used the 1939 index as 100 but then because it was getting up so high the Federal Government, to fool people and get their minds off it, changed the index year to 1949, so this threw the 1939 index back to 63) the official index for 1939 in relation to 1949 was 63. Well it stayed that way pretty well and went up two or three points a year, up to 1946, it had only gone up to 77. It had only gone up 14 points in all that time. Then, we know what the Liberal Government did in Ottawa; they removed price controls and immediately upped the index figure. In 1946-47 it went up 7 points; in

February 23, 1960

1947-48 it went up 6 points; in 1948 to 1951 it went up 14 points, in fact in 1951 the index went up 11 points in one year. Eleven points in one year! Did you see anything in the Leader-Post? They didn't realize that the life savings of all people who have life insurance policies, the pensioners, would be taken away; they didn't realize that some people had put their hands into your pockets and taken away 10 per cent of all your wealth, in one year, under a Liberal Administration. And so it kept on climbing until 1957 when it was 122. That's what it was when the Government was changed: from 63 to 122, 1939 to 1957. The value of the dollar went down during that period of time from \$1 to about 53 cents.

In 1957 and 1958 the Conservatives went on a spending orgy, had plenty of money to pay for it with the volume of money going up very, very sharply, right until October of 1958. It is little wonder that the cost of living index again began to rise. But now, the strange thing is, because the Conservative Government is doing it, our friends in the Leader-Post suddenly wakened up and started a series of really excellent articles and I do want sincerely to commend them for them. The only thing is that they were just 15 years too late. Since 1958, Mr. Speaker, the cost of living index has gone up from 122 until today it is 127.9 — call it 128. It has gone up 6 points in 2½ years. Think of all the fuss they are making about it but when it went up as much as 11 points in one year we heard nothing about it.

With the cost of living index at 128, compared to 63, we all have a dollar which is worth about 48 cents. We are playing around now with 48-cent dollars. As a consequence, the cost of everything that our rural municipalities are doing has gone up; the cost of everything in our schools has gone up. I have here a statement which was prepared by the president of one of the Liberal associations in the province, a very excellent man and one who is interested in education and has been on the Trustees Association for many, many years. He points out that in 1935, which is 25 years ago, we had more pupils in our schools than we have today. At that time we had 220,000 children, but the total cost of education was only \$7,000,000 in 1935. By 1940 it had gone up to \$8,500,000; by 1945, after the present Government was elected to office, it was up to \$14½ million, and we had 175,000 pupils. Mr. Speaker, today, the cost of education in Saskatchewan is roughly \$60 million. Sixty million dollars, for 200,000 pupils. Three hundred dollars per pupil today is the cost for education. Back in 1935 it was \$32, ten times as much today for the cost of education today to what it was in 1935. Or, if you go back to 1945, it cost \$83 per pupil, roughly four times as much today as then.

Now, who is to accept the responsibility for this large increase in the cost of education? Is it the Provincial Government that is responsible? We do not administer the schools. The schools are administered by autonomous school boards throughout this province and I am sure that we all agree they are doing generally an excellent job in administration. I think they are endeavouring to keep their costs down to reasonable levels. Yet,

in spite of that, their costs have gone up from \$14½ million to \$60 million in a 15-year period.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the province paid 21 percent of the cost of education. When we read about the statements that are alleged to have been made by the Premier, certainly the wrong interpretation is placed upon them by Opposition members, when they say that the Provincial Government accepted full responsibility for education. Well, if \$14,500,000 was the total amount it cost to take full responsibility for education in 1945, we have certainly done that and have done much more, because today the Provincial Government is spending \$24 million in school grants alone and, as has been announced from the Speech from the Throne, this amount will be increased. In other words, the Provincial Government today is spending in grants almost twice as much as the total cost of education in 1945. Is it any wonder then that costs have gone up for the school districts. Now can we expect the Provincial Government to keep pace with it. Sixteen percent of the cost of education was being paid by the Provincial Government in 1925, 21 percent in 1935, 21 percent in 1945 and 45 percent today, so you can see that we are paying more than double the amount on a percentage basis and approximately 10 times as much on a dollar basis. So then let us not be so critical of the Government for what we have failed to do. Let's put the blame fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Federal Government who have allowed this inflation to go on and have allowed these costs to increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been told that we haven't done anything to help the farmers with the terrific load they are carrying. I can see these increased grants for education as helping. This is one of the most costly things. Look at his tax bill and see what most of his taxes go for today. It's for education. Do you realize that today a grant of \$24 million is the equivalent of 24 mills on the dollar? Twenty-four mills on the dollar is the total amount we are giving to the school districts to assist them. Twenty-four mills on the dollar! But I would like to point out that there are other things. For instance, provision of power. My hon. friends are very critical of the \$500. Well, if you went to the west, up to Alberta, there you would find that the farmers are paying anywhere from a \$1,000 to \$1,400. The farmer pays the full cost. Here much of the argument in this province is the treatment of the farmers compared with the way we are treating our people in the towns and villages. In fact, they are treated a little bit better, because we realize that it is costing more to take electricity to the farmers. What we have done is to take the average cost of delivering the electricity to the people in our towns and villages, and then we have allowed the farmer that amount and are asking the farmer to pay the additional amount. Now, my hon. friend for Melville shakes his head over there. Well, first of all he was opposed to the Government being in the power business. I want to say that the whole Liberal party was opposed to it. I have the evidence here, when this question came up in this House some years ago to buy the Dominion Electric Company, the press of March 8, 1945, when we really got it, says: "The bill was hotly opposed by opposition members."

February 23, 1960

Mr. Danielson: — Who said so?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The 'Leader-Post' informed us. Mr. Proctor went after us very bitterly in 1945. Mr. Proctor was very critical and said we had paid too much for it, as this was not a good one.

Mr. Danielson: — We are paying too much for that old junk.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — In 1929 the Conservatives first set up a Power Commission. In 1944, we know that the Power Commission as it existed at that time simply was a conglomeration of little diesel plants scattered all over the province with the exception of the one unit in Saskatoon, and even today it is just being used as a stand-by. The Power Commission had been losing money. There was a total accumulated deficit of some \$230,000. They were not making any effort to get power out in large quantities to the people of the province. Wherever you would go you would find these little diesel plants scattered about, with people having to pay up to 25 cents a kilowatt. I remember a few years ago, going down the Cannington constituency to the village of Kennedy. The lady who was operating the hotel said: "Mr. Fines, you will have to be in by 10:30 because the lights go out at that time. If you are after that you'll have to use a coal oil lamp."

Mr. Danielson: — I wonder what he was doing out at that time of night.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the thing that made it all the more difficult was when the dear old lady told me she was paying 25 cents a kilowatt for electricity for that hotel. Twenty-five cents a kilowatt! The standard price being charged by the Power Commission in those days was 16 cents a kilowatt. Within the first 5 years there had been 5 reductions in rates, until today the highest rate charges anywhere is 8 cents a kilowatt, and that, of course for a small number of kilowatts.

The Liberal party have been opposed to it. The leader of the Liberal party — I have a statement here of a man who was formerly Premier of this province, a gentleman who sat up in the gallery this afternoon gazing down proudly at his son as he made his speech. Mr. Speaker, what did he have to say about it?

Mr. Gardiner: — He said it was a good speech!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — This is what he had to say:

"A power line runs within two miles of my farm in Saskatchewan. My farm is lighted and has a water pressure system in the buildings and is equipped for every convenience except electric heating and equipment such as a grain grinder which requires high power, but I do not draw from the power line. The reason is that in our section we can harness the air and obtain electric power from a windmill."

Mr. McDonald: — You're doing pretty good tonight yourself, Clarence!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well now, Mr. Speaker, there was the whole philosophy of the Liberal party. Windmills! Windmills to supply electricity! Well I will grant you that in certain quarters probably a windmill would work; I would think that the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Gardiner), this afternoon, generated almost enough wind to develop some electricity.

Mr. McDonald: — You're doing pretty good yourself.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this Power Corporation has done a tremendous amount to bring electricity to our farms. For example, in 1944, in Manitoba there were all kinds of farms with electric power at that time. When I left Manitoba away back in 1923 electricity was out in the rural parts then.

Mr. Gardiner: — They kicked you out.

Mr. Danielson: — Have you ever been back?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But in this province we had 138 farms electrified, after 35 years of Liberal government. That is about four farms a year that were electrified. We now have about 60,000. For the Liberals to have 60,000 at the rate they were going it would have taken them approximately 15,000 years! Well that is just a little bit too long to wait, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Batten: — The financial genius!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, this is one of the things which I believe the Government has done — not only to have helped the farmers economically, but also to make life a little more endurable and I believe it is one of the things that the farmers do appreciate.

Now our Crown Corporations have been criticized. We have heard a lot of nonsense and I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that people going down to eastern Canada spreading rumors about these Corporations are not doing the province any good. For instance, I have a 'Globe and Mail' here of February 16th last, just a few days ago:

“United States Potash Company gives a Dundas firm a \$750,000 order. Rumors that multi-million dollar United States Fertilizing companies, which have invested upwards of 440 million in Saskatchewan potash deposit, are pulling out without attaining production are bunk.”

This statement is by Dr. Lebaron, vice-president of International Mining. He said:

February 23, 1960

“Contrary to reports big United States potash producers are . . . the records of Saskatchewan. Dr. Lebaron predicted that in the next few years every company in the potash business in the world will be operating in Saskatchewan.”

Government Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well we know that false reports come out — there was one on March 3, 1949, for example. I had to get up in this House and correct a statement that was made which appeared in the Kamsack ‘Times’, a paper in the seat of my hon. friend from Pelly. At that time the then Liberal member made some very vicious statements. For example: “The Sodium Sulphate Plant at Chaplin had been closed for lack of orders.” We were shipping out a couple of carloads every day.

Mr. Cameron: — You were at the wrong end of the lake.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — There was another statement — that the bus lines were in distress and it would appear that the Bus Company would discontinue operations. That the Brick Factory would close, because they couldn’t produce bricks in the winter; and that the people of the province had lost \$6 million — all the money they had put into these Crown Corporations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can look up the 1949 Journals and there are the facts; you will find the statement and the reply that was given. We all know that these Crown Corporations today are carrying on very, very successfully. On Friday I shall be tabling the reports of these Corporations, which will show that they have had a record year. The 1958-59 year will be much the largest year in the history of these Corporations, with a revenue surplus of over \$1,400,000, which will be about 16 per cent return on the investment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing very much wrong with Corporations that can do that. I must say that it is certainly different from the Liberal record. You know the briquetting plant which the Manitoba Government, the Saskatchewan Government and the Federal Government all got into, they put in \$1 million, carried on for a few years and then sold it to a private company for \$1.00. I can think of other Liberal experiments; I can think for example, of the Avro Jet aeroplanes, in which they spent over \$400 million and then, after spending \$400 million, scrapped the whole thing.

Mr. McDonald: — Who scrapped it?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The Government of the day scrapped it because —

Mr. Danielson: — Then blame it on the Tories!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now my hon. friends can argue that it was a good aeroplane but I will take the word of the people who are in a position to decide about that.

Mr. McFarlane: — Who did the squawking? Hazen Argue.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, one of these Crown Corporations particularly has been under fire. I refer, of course, to the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. The report was tabled the other day and that report shows that the Insurance Office has had the most successful year yet, with a surplus of some \$508,000. This brings the total amount, which has been turned over to the Provincial Treasury, to approximately \$3½ million. Business, last year, increased by some 17 per cent. The Automobile Insurance Act also carried on very satisfactorily last year. I shall have something to say about that when I introduce certain amendments to the Act within a day or two.

Mr. Speaker, this Insurance Office was formed in 1945. In 1944 I introduced the legislation which is now standing and I stated that there are several reasons for getting into the insurance business. One of those reasons was to keep the money in Saskatchewan instead of sending it all down to the East. The second reason was to provide employment in this province, and the third reason was to get the premiums reduced. I think we have done those things. Insurance rates today are very low compared to what they were, and compared to what they are in our neighbouring provinces. Employment — we now have some 400 Head Office employees; the jobs would not be here if it were not for our Insurance Office. Money kept in Saskatchewan — some \$16 million, or \$18 million if you count the two companies, money which is invested in our province, in our school districts and municipalities, helping to build up Saskatchewan rather than build up some other part of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the rates? I have here in my hand a photostatic copy of a page from the Western Canada Underwriter, which sets out the rates for insurance. For a building situated in Manitoba or Alberta the rate is 70 cents per one hundred; for a dwelling situated in Saskatchewan, the rate is 40 cents per one hundred. There, Mr. Speaker, is a saving of 30 cents, or 42 per cent, on fire insurance business alone. And yet our hon. friends say we are not doing anything to help the farmers! This year alone we have put into operation reduced premiums on the fire business on the farms amounting in some instances to as much as 50 per cent. Today farmers are paying around 50 cents per \$100 for their fire insurance. Compare that to \$1.50 and \$2.00 they were paying 15 years ago. Then you can see the tremendous savings to the farmers.

I also have here, Mr. Speaker, the Annual Report of the Supt. of Insurance for the year 1958. This report indicates that in the year 1958 the total amount of fire insurance business written in Saskatchewan was \$9 million. Now if we are saving 40 per cent, as the figures indicate we are compared to the rates the other companies charge, than this represents 60 per cent of what the people in Manitoba and Alberta are paying. They would be paying, for the same insurance, Mr. Speaker, \$15 million. We are paying \$9 million. There is a saving, in fire insurance alone of \$6 million for the people of Saskatchewan.

February 23, 1960

Mr. Speaker, I made this statement six months ago; copies have been sent to the Western Canada Fire Underwriters and to the Canadian Insurance Underwriters and they have not denied it but have made the statement that they cannot deny the figures because they know they are correct. That is on our fire insurance only.

Let's take the farm truck insurance. Everybody, when they are driving a vehicle of any kind, whether it is a truck or not, knows that they should have insurance. I think that is something that is pretty well recognized. And what do we find?

On the standard policy in Alberta and Manitoba, they provide \$50,000 and \$100,000 public liability; property damage of \$10,000; collision, \$25 deductible; comprehensive — they have full coverage except for \$25 deductible on glass. But they have no Part Two coverage. In Saskatchewan, we provide \$60,000 and \$120,000 public liability, \$10,000 more. Property damage, \$10,000 — the same as other provinces; collision, \$25 deductible; comprehensive, full coverage except for \$25 deductible on glass. Then we have the Part Two which provides death benefits up to \$5,000 for children, \$5,000 for the widow, which totals \$10,000. It provides the out-of-work benefits; \$25 a week up to 120 weeks; we provide supplementary benefits at \$1,000; supplementary benefits which pay doctor bills, or pay ambulance charges, special nurses and anything of this sort. You will notice by the Bill we are proposing that this will be doubled to \$2000 for next year.

We are providing funeral benefits. All of this is in addition to what is being provided in Manitoba and Alberta, and yet what does it cost? Well, in Saskatchewan under the Act every farmer pays the \$8.00 and the \$2.00 for operator's license, when he gets his license. Then in taking out a package policy there is an additional \$21.000. So there's the \$31.00, and this is for a 1956 one-ton farm truck in each case . . . \$31.00 in Saskatchewan; in Manitoba it is \$52.96, and in Alberta it is \$76.30. The people of Saskatchewan get their insurance, Mr. Speaker, for 40 percent of what it is in Alberta, a saving of \$45.00 on every farm truck.

The same, too, with their automobiles. This is a 1956 Chev. or Ford, and again the same coverage pretty well as the truck, and of course the Part Two benefits. Yet we find in rural Alberta, the rates are \$97.54; in Saskatchewan the rates are \$47. \$50 savings on every passenger car. Well, Mr. Speaker, figure it out. I don't care what figure you use, whether you take \$50 or \$40 savings, but I do know in this province we have 325,000 vehicles insured. If you take an average savings of \$20, and I know that is too low, but let's keep it low — there is a savings on automobile insurance of \$6½ million for the people of this province. Put those two things together, Mr. Speaker, and you have \$12½ million. Yet we have the new Liberal Leader reported in 'The Star-Phoenix', August 27th, 1959, saying:

“he would favour the sale of most minor Crown Corporations in the province if a Liberal Government was elected.”

Then he goes on to say he:

“... would favour the sale of Saskatchewan Government Insurance to private enterprise if he was assured it would continue to operate in Saskatchewan.”

Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, he and lots of his friends would be mighty willing to operate the Insurance Company if he was ever elected here. I just don't think the people of Saskatchewan are going to let anybody get their hands on their own insurance company. I think the people of this province are going to hang on to it.

My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Batten) says she drafted the platform for the Liberal Party. Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, . . .

Mrs. Batten: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the hon. Provincial Treasurer is certainly confused. He may draft the platform for the C.C.F. party, but in the Liberal Party it is the Convention that draws up the platform. I was merely the Chairman . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I should have said the hon. lady drafted the resolutions on which the platform was based.

Mrs. Batten: — I didn't do that either. I was merely Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — But, immediately, after the Convention the new leader said: “Well, I don't care what the Convention did. I'm going to draft the platform, and I will decide what is going to be done.” So really, you might as well save yourself all that trouble.

Mrs. Batten: — You copied it, and didn't do so good . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment or two to deal with one or two other things. I regret the statement made by the hon. member yesterday when he referred to all the buildings that had been put up. He said he had a return showing \$51 million in buildings constructed since 1944 and it is no wonder, because the civil service is now up to 12,500 and we need it to house all those civil servants. To get that he should have taken the cost of the administration building, and the cost of the health building and he would have deducted the amount of rents that were being paid to every Liberal heeler downtown in 1944 that had office space for rent. He would have done that, if he had wanted to be fair, but he didn't. Mr. Speaker, among those buildings, (and I want to say now the figure is not \$51 million any more — it is up over \$57 million) that most of that money has

February 23, 1960

gone into the University of Saskatchewan and the University Hospital and has gone into the Mental Hospital or the Training School at Moose Jaw — some \$8 million or \$9 million, and has gone into the Geriatric centres in Melfort and here in Regina. It has gone into the Museum; it hasn't all gone into housing for civil servants.

Mr. Speaker, from 1905 to 1944 in this province, the Liberal Party spent \$24,200,000 on all buildings, including this building, what university buildings there were, the Court House, Land Titles Office, everything — that was the total amount they spent, and yet in 1944, when we took office, we found there was still owing on those buildings \$23,400,000. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party had spent \$800,000 in cash in a 40-year period. \$20,000 a year was what it had spent. You can figure out for yourself how long it would have taken, at that rate, to have paid off this total amount of \$24 million.

Hon. Mr. Erb: — Inefficiency!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — At that rate it would have taken 1200 years before the buildings would be paid for! Mr. Speaker, this building in which we are tonight cost in the neighbourhood of \$3 million. It was constructed in 1909-1912, which is 50 years ago. In that 50 year-period we have been paying it off in recent years and some more will be paid off within the next month, on the 15th of March. But the building will not finally be paid for until 1963. There is still owing just a few odd thousand dollars on it. From 1905 to 1959 — a period of 50 years, we have paid in interest alone, approximately \$7 million on this building. By the time we pay it off, the building will cost \$10 million. Figure it out. The buildings we have put up — \$57 million at the same rate would have cost \$570 million. Mr. Speaker, that \$23,400,000 that was owing in 1944 has been reduced to \$9 million. We have paid for every building we have constructed, and have paid off \$14 million in Liberal debts besides!

Mr. Speaker, a similar situation applied to highways. My hon. friend, the youngest member on the opposition side told us this afternoon . . .

Premier Douglas: — He's gone to bed!

Mr. McDonald: — He got tired! There's not much interest here.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Up to 1944 the Liberal Party spent on highways some \$87 million. Yet we found when we came into office there were \$32 million of debt still owing on the highways. I want to make one thing perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker. This \$87 million was not the amount that was spent on the construction; this is everything — construction, maintenance and everything all bunched together. Yet \$32 million of that was still owing in July, 1944. Yet the highways were all gone — there was nothing here but the debt; that was all we could find when we came into office.

Today we are owing some \$18 million on provincial highways in Saskatchewan. We have paid off some \$14 million of this Liberal debt, and

have spent \$240 million, every dollar of which has been paid for. No interest charges. Again, Mr. Speaker, these are the people that have the nerve to go about this province, misleading the people of Saskatchewan, telling them that this province is increasing its debts at such a rate that it is becoming a danger to the people. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you . . .

Mr. Danielson: — \$16 million dollars . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — . . . I think this is one of the most despicable things I ever heard. The hon. members know that the most of the debt which has been created is for power. They know that in 1945 the total debt on power was only \$8 million, which shows the very little they did. They know that today the debt on power is some \$240 millions. Mr. Speaker, it is consumers, the customers of the Power Corporation that will be paying that debt; not the taxpayers of the province. There was some mention the other day of the \$3 million profit from the Power Corporation, but before we could get that \$3 million the interest on all this debt had to be paid, and sinking funds had to be paid. Yet here they are suggesting we should reduce rates. But, on the other hand they go about the province, telling the people they are in danger of having to pay this interest. You can't do it both ways. Make up your minds what you want.

Mr. Danielson: — You'll have quite a job convincing them they don't have to pay it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I was very interested when we came into office in 1944, to find the city of Regina and the Liberal Government had engaged in a housing deal to the amount of \$586,000. This goes back to 1912, to the days of the cyclone. At that time the city of Regina wanted to help some of the people of Regina reconstruct their homes. They came to the Government for financial assistance. The Government refused them any help — it is not the way we did for Kamsack when they had a cyclone. They refused to do anything. The City were told to go and borrow the money. The City couldn't borrow the money because the market was very bad. The Government said, "Well we'll lend you the money and you have to give us a mortgage on all the property the City owns" and the City owned quite a bit of property in those days. So they took a mortgage on their property, gave the City \$500,000. Well, the City thought it convenient not to borrow the money. You know, once you get it in your pocket you don't bother. The city didn't bother. It is very interesting to go through these files and see the threatening letters that came from the Government of the day, threatening the city with foreclosure on more than one occasion, threatening the City with if they didn't pay this money back.

Mr. McDonald: — You'd just go ahead and foreclose!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, the City did pay them back in 1921. The City paid the whole thing back — the \$500,000. Oh yes, I should have told you that the Government borrowed the money, and of course they could

only sell the bonds at about ninety; so they had to borrow \$540,000. So the City paid back the \$540,000. What did the Government of the day do? They used it for current operating expenses; they didn't put it into sinking funds or bonds at all. Then the bond came due in 1929. What did the government do? They just refunded the whole thing, the \$540,000. But this time bond prices were not good again, and they had to take a substantial discount, so they had to get \$586,000, in order to pay off the old \$540,000 loan. Here we were, in 1944 with this debt staying on the Statute Books right up until 1958. In 1958 the bonds came due and we had to pay them off. Mr. Speaker, this is an example of Liberal financing!

Government Member: — What was the total amount of that?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The total amount of that was from 1912, with interest at approximately 6 per cent of the effective rate which was \$30,000 a year interest, Mr. Speaker, for a period of approximately 45 years. So you see, it was quite a substantial amount — roughly about \$1,500,000; it cost the people of this province \$1,300,000.

Mr. McFarlane: — What would you have done?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well, now, . . . Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Speech from the Throne is a very constructive document. I think the health program, and I must confess to my friend the Leader of the Opposition, that he was quite right in the statement he made the other day, and that is that the Liberal party had been promising this longer than we have. He is quite right. Since 1919 on the Liberal party had been promising and promising. I hope we don't get opposition on this the way we did with the hospitalization. When this Government introduced hospitalization in 1946 we met with a great deal of opposition. The Leader of the Liberal Party at that time objected very strenuously. He said:

“the C.C.F. Hospitalization scheme which goes into effect January 1st would cost many persons more money than similar services would cost under present municipal schemes.”

Walter Tucker, Provincial Liberal leader said in an address on Provincial Affairs broadcast over Saskatchewan's radio stations this week:

“Mr. Tucker contends that the extension of municipal services would include the entire cost, would provide cheaper hospitalization for all, as hospital facilities became available.”

Mr. Danielson: — Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tucker wasn't in the House in . . .

Hon. Mr. Fines: — No, but he was your leader.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . on that side of the House or any other side; that's not true.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, the statement was made by the Leader of the Opposition on December 24, 1946, and it was reported in the Regina 'Leader-Post', and it was a broadcast. Now I know my hon. friend doesn't hear everything I say, but I want to make that clear — it was a broadcast and he said that the extension of municipal services would have been cheaper. He wasn't the only one. There was another gentleman, and that is the hon. member for Arm River (Mr. Danielson). I now refer to the 'Leader-Post' of February 13, 1947:

“Under the new hospitalization scheme hospitals would lose the hospital grant formerly paid . . . “

Mr. Danielson: — Sure.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — The Article goes on:

“. . . If the hospitals received the grant they would be able to carry on, but without it operating costs would have to be paid by the municipalities in spite of the \$5.00 collected from each citizen, Mr. Danielson said.

“The inaugural procedure has been set up and a large percentage of the money collected will be used in salaries and expenses incurred in collecting the \$5.00, the member said.”

Mr. Danielson: — Everything I said has proven to be true.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — He said:

“The service would not be as efficient as the people could provide for themselves through their communities.”

Mr. Danielson: — That's right.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Well we could go on; there are lots of others here, Mr. Speaker, who discussed the hospitalization scheme and objected very strenuously to it. Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Tyerman, Mrs. Gucker claimed it would be regimentation, and here we have Dr. Beattie Martin, the late Dr. Beattie Martin, who said one of the tragedies of this form of practice — he said under it doctors would have fixed income, easier hours and no competition.

Mr. McDonald: — What constituency did he represent?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Dr. Riffel, the Liberal candidate, said that since the Federal Government made pensions to those over seventy

February 23, 1960

universal, he felt that the Provincial Government should be equally generous and give universal pre-paid health care to all pensioners over seventy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that when this Bill comes before the House it will have the unanimous support of the members of this House and that we will not have the kind of opposition from the Liberal party, that we had when the hospitalization plan was introduced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one more thing I would like to refer to, and that is the suggestion that has been made that this Province can afford to give up any of its taxes. The Liberal party has come out, again trying to bribe the people with their own money, by offering to refund the \$500 on power. They are also offering to allow purple gas to be used in farm trucks.

Mr. McDonald: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Not just for farming operations, but all operations. Mr. Speaker, I would like, first of all, to point out that we estimate that the total amount of revenue lost would be \$2,400,000. Now that is the figure which is based upon statistics of the gasoline used. I don't know, it may be high, it may be low, but it is the best guess we have been able to come up with. As a matter of fact, they sent up two answers to me to that question — one answer was “no information”, the other was the answer I submitted. Now I thought, in fairness, I should give the hon. members the figure because the Leader of the Opposition used a figure of \$1 million, the member for Hanley used \$5 million, and so I thought we should get something that might be close to being right.

Mr. McFarlane: — You just took the average.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — I don't think the people of this province would like to see the Government lose this revenue and have to lose the services that this revenue is necessary to provide. First, the grid roads — this year we will be spending some \$7 million on the grid roads; that would be a total tax rate of approximately 10 mills on the dollar, approximately 10 mills on the dollar. I am sure that the farmers don't want to have to give up the grid road, or any portion of it. I showed you, for example, what they can save on the farm trucks on insurance — three times as much for their car as their farm truck; that is the saving on their insurance. I just don't think they are going to take a chance on losing these benefits; obviously, if this revenue is given up the people are going to have to have less insurance. Our budget is just balanced, it is running nip and tuck, as I can show you on the budget.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes, that is your Administration.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, we have given the Opposition opportunities of showing where savings could be made. To date they have not come up with anything.

Mr. McDonald: — Can't understand it.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Now, the leader of the Liberal party, outside where he has no responsibility, made a statement Sept. 12, 1959:

“Ross Thatcher, provincial Leadership candidate, said here Friday, he believed the time had come when the three percent sales tax could be abolished.”

He wants to get rid of the whole thing!

Mr. McFarlane: — The Premier says it will have to be increased.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Twenty-four million dollars he is willing to sacrifice for political expediency.

Mr. McDonald: — Well you were going to take it off.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, if this tax is revoked one of two things will happen — we shall either have to reduce our services, or secondly we shall have to go back to the old Liberal policy of borrowing for everything they could borrow — put this Province back in debt again. After getting the Province out of debt, I think the people of Saskatchewan want to see it stay there.

There has been a great deal of criticism about lack of industrial development and the reasons for the lack of industrial development. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that these statements are very unfair and unwarranted. There is a statement here that was made in 1945:

“We in Saskatchewan are forced to pay higher freight rates than any other part of the country. Our standard of living is adversely affected in proportion. In addition, the higher freight rates are one of the chief reasons for Saskatchewan's lack of industrial development. New industries are handicapped from the beginning meeting eastern competition by the excessive rates. The Canadian railway rate structure makes extremely difficult industrial development except in one section of the country — that strip of territory lying between Montreal and Windsor.

“The people of Saskatchewan will also be disappointed that the Administration has not seen fit to embark on any major irrigation program at the present time. The three factors which I have briefly touched upon — high tariffs, high freight rates and lack of irrigation — have all contributed to make Saskatchewan a province almost without industry.

“Once again, it seems this province is a forgotten unit. In the past one Federal Government after another has overlooked the vital needs of Saskatchewan. The present Administration, unless it offers some major policies will perpetuate the serious economic injustice.”

That statement, Mr. Speaker, was made in Ottawa on November 28, 1945, and can be found in Hansard on Page 2638 and the speaker was the present Liberal leader in this province. He set out very clearly at that time the reason why industry hadn't come to Saskatchewan. Then he went on to say:

“The industrialization program of the provincial C.C.F. government has already provided employment for several thousand Saskatchewan citizens, many of whom are veterans.

“The government will do all in its power to encourage private capital to establish industries in the province but that in the past forty years private capital had shown little inclination to build factories in Saskatchewan.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted when I read the front page of the paper tonight, for instance, and see another industry announced in the city of Moose Jaw; I want to congratulate the members for Moose Jaw on this industry. Every day we read of new industries springing up in this province.

Mr. McDonald: — Every day?

Hon. Mr. Fines: — Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is going ahead and there is no amount of ranting and raving by hon. members opposite will ever make the people of this province believe it isn't and because of that I feel confident that the people want that progress to continue and because the people themselves outlined the program and continue to outline the program for Saskatchewan, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I wish to join previous speakers in extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion. I particularly want to extend congratulations to the hon. member for Kinistino (Mr. Thibault) who made his maiden speech in the House. I had the same experience, as he has had, not too long ago, and I believe he acquitted himself very well. I would also like to associate myself with the member for Notukeu-Willowbunch (Mr. Klein) and the hon. member for Wilkie (Mr. Horsman) in the compliments they passed on your behalf. I believe that is concurred in by all members of the legislature.

Before I go on to some of the remarks that I hope to be able to make tonight to members of the Legislature, I must disagree with my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer, because I am one of those people who believe there are not two classes of citizens in the province of Saskatchewan. I certainly contend (and I am sure there are a number of people who agree with me, and who think likewise, in spite of his remarks) that the farmers in this province, in paying \$500 for connection of electric power in their yards were discriminated against. I know it is a very great amount of money, because it runs into millions of dollars. I am still satisfied that, if we can proceed to build luxurious buildings in the City of Regina, and elsewhere in the province, buildings that we could possibly get along without, as well as some of the other luxuries and extravagance which have been entered into by this Government, then I believe they cannot say too much about giving consideration to the refund of this amount that has been paid by the farm people of this province.

The Provincial Treasurer also claims, or I would take this from his remarks, that he is opposed to refunding any of this money to the farm people of Saskatchewan. I take it for granted he is supported by all members on the other side of the House. He claims that by successful elections and such like, the majority of people, or all the people of Saskatchewan, are with him except those who vote Liberal. I want to remind the Provincial Treasurer of Saskatchewan that it isn't by virtue of a majority vote of all the people of this province that he is sitting in his seat today.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That's more than you've got!

Mr. Barrie: — Approximately 60 per cent of the people did not support the party that he represents and they have opinions different from his.

Mr. Speaker, there were certain remarks that were made about the Provincial Museum, and I admit that I did make those remarks. I believe (and I think if he had read possibly all that I had said) he would have said that I claimed this was a very fine building — something that probably the people of Saskatchewan can well be proud of, and myself, too. But at the same time I have been, and know from experience with certain departmental employees and officials of this Government, the lack of accommodation which exists for certain indigent people. I want to compliment the Government, and those responsible for the Geriatric Centres which have been set up in this province to date. But I believe the Minister of Social Welfare (Hon. Mr. Bentley) and the other Ministers of the Crown will agree there is a lack of accommodation for that type of citizen in Saskatchewan. I certainly think that before we enter into a building program, providing buildings such as the Provincial Museum, which is a very fine thing to have, provided we can afford it, that there are other buildings and accommodation where that money could be used where it would bring benefit to more worthy people.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — He also made mention, and I believe tried to impress this Legislature that I was attacking the individual civil servant. I don't know how he took from what I said that I was attacking any civil servant. Surely no civil servant wants to be employed, if he is not needed. I believe that with prudent business administration and co-ordination of certain services that are now carried on by the Government, a reduction in the number of Departments and cabinet Ministers in Saskatchewan could probably be made and we could reduce the number of civil servants in this province and still provide an efficient administration. In no way can he say that is an attack against the civil servants.

He also made a reference to the Kamsack cyclone. I want to admit this Government made a very fine gesture when that particular tragedy occurred in the town of Kamsack, but I think you will find that not too much, if any, of the contributions offered by the Provincial Government, actually were used, due to the generosity of people all over Canada and elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. Fines: — We were ready and willing.

Mr. Barrie; — Yes, I give you credit for that. But I believe, due to the generosity of people all over Canada and the United States, it wasn't necessary to call on the Provincial Government for the contribution you had made. I would get the impression from what he said here today that they had been particularly generous, and to that degree they were, but they did not, I believe, make any contribution that was worthwhile and substantial to the replacement of buildings, and such like, in the town of Kamsack. I just wanted to clear up that point.

There was another reference made in connection with buildings that could have been erected. I believe you missed the boat. I spoke in this House (I don't know whether it was last Session or the Session before), and I am going to give you the same example. In the village of Pelly we have a very fine rink of which we are very proud; a regulation-size rink with all the accommodations that an up-to-date rink has. We are very fortunate today in having in that community of Pelly that splendid rink, well finished, which didn't cost the people of Pelly one cent, due to taking advantage of storage income that could be gained at that particular time. There is no reason in the world why this could not have been duplicated in many communities all through Saskatchewan. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer and his colleagues should admit that possibly they passed up something which has been well worthwhile, because at the same time, it wouldn't only be the buildings these communities would benefit from today, but during that period when grain was stored, (whether the Federal Government was to blame, or whether it was helping them out, is beside the point) it assisted many farmers who were able to deliver grain, and thereby get cash advances at that particular time.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — I don't propose to compete with the hon. Provincial Treasurer with his years of experience, knowledge and ability, so I am not going to deal with remarks which he might make. But I want to make one reference to the Speech from the Throne on an item which I am very pleased with, and which I believe a number of people in my constituency will be pleased with, and that is in connection with the proposed legislation which will give Indians of Saskatchewan a vote. I hope, and I assume when that vote is granted to these people, that it will not in any way conflict or take from the present rights . . . the treaty rights they have today. I am sure that has been taken care of. I believe this is a step in the right direction and I believe it will be appreciated by our Indian population. Possibly it will go a long way to establish in them, and increase their pride and stature up until this time, we might say, they have considered themselves, and in many cases have been by the white population, termed second-class citizens. I agree with the member for Cumberland that possibly this won't benefit too many of the older people. We hope as the years go by they will take a pride in this privilege now extended to them, and we'll find they will take their place among the first-class citizens in Saskatchewan, wherever they are resident.

Now as most members realize and know in the part of Saskatchewan which I have the honour to represent we had last fall very unfavourable harvest weather. I come from an area, where in the northern part of my constituency the farmers have thousands upon thousands of bushels under the snow and, while the assistance that has been given by the joint efforts of both the Federal and Provincial Governments is of some benefit, I have some criticism to offer because this scheme is not, amongst the majority of the people, very satisfactory. There is real hardship and there has been for some months past . . . real hardship and privation experienced by many of those people and some of them are in a serious plight. They have a very bleak outlook for the next few months until another crop is taken off. I believe that most of these people are going to be sadly disappointed in the returns they will receive this spring irrespective of how favourable the weather may be. This is quite a different matter to what it was in 1951 and 1952. Most of this grain was soaked and dried and soaked last fall until the very best we could expect was about the lowest grade, particularly of wheat. During this winter wild life, particularly deer, in some localities, have taken terrific toll, and I think you will find that in many cases the expenses of taking this crop off in the spring may not be recovered from the sale of that grain. This is one of the first major problems that this Government is confronted with at this time. I think they were very disappointed, possibly other people were too, in that they had to share the contribution that was being made to these unfortunate people in our province.

I was rather surprised at the attitude that the Premier of this province and other members of the Government took in connection with this particular emergency. I am quite certain that if we had found that the

February 23, 1960

Federal Government were going to assume the full payment of the assistance that was going to be rendered, \$3.00 an acre, to the unfortunate farmers in our province and the other two prairie provinces, we would have heard great cries that it was insufficient; that it wasn't enough, and that it should have been \$5.00 or \$7.00 an acre. We didn't hear any of that particular kind of criticism, but immediately the Premier talked of having possibly to reduce some of the other services that were being rendered to the people of the province of Saskatchewan on account of the contribution they would have to make as their share.

I notice that the Leader-Post has been quoted and quoted in this House during this Session and other Sessions and I'm going to follow suit. This is from an editorial in the Leader-Post on the 14th day of December last year, and I'm going to quote part of this editorial:

“In his announcement, Mr. Douglas said he was sure the people of Saskatchewan would appreciate the fact that every million dollars the province has to spend on the aid program would be a like amount less than that which was available for education, health, welfare, or provincial and municipal roads . . .”

Premier Douglas: — Isn't that a simple statement of fact?

Mr. Barrie: —

“It would be of little value in giving farmers acreage payments with one hand if we have to reduce our grants for education, and municipal roads with the other.”

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have heard in this Legislature and outside this legislature very severe criticism about the Liberal and Conservative Governments during the thirties for their reduction in service and because they didn't maintain such services. What these people have had to contend with this year, and I feel it is a very substantial amount of money, was just a drop in the bucket to what these Governments had to contend with during the thirties. I want to remind the Government members opposite that during those thirties the revenues in this province, with the huge problems that those Governments had to contend with, at the lowest point were \$12,000,000.

Now just imagine, with 75 percent on relief due to droughts and the conditions over which the people in those areas had no control, that the Provincial Government of that day had a revenue, a total revenue, of \$12,000,000. They didn't do all that should have been done, I agree, but now we find one particular major catastrophe that has happened in this province that covers about a third of the farmers of the province . . . with the revenue of \$133 millions of dollars . . . that they begin to talk immediately about reducing certain services. Surely some economy could have been made and would have been made in other respects before they would start on the municipal services as outlined by our Premier.

Some Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Now in connection with this particular plan that was put forward by the Federal Government in which the three prairie provinces had to share, it was up to the Provincial Government to provide the Federal Government with a formula by which this would be administered, and which would have to be approved by the Federal Government. Well the formula, I assume, was drawn up by the Minister of Agriculture, or in conjunction with his colleagues in the Cabinet and was submitted to the Federal Government at Ottawa. That formula was accepted and approved by the Federal Government, but the Minister of Agriculture in the Canadian government made certain qualifications. He said he wanted it made quite clear that he assumed no responsibility for this particular formula.

Well, let's see what that formula was in comparison with the one that has been used in our two neighbouring provinces. It means that the farmers of the province of Saskatchewan who were in the unfortunate position to have their crop under the snow are not receiving, and will not receive, in every case, under this particular plan in Saskatchewan, the same as a farmer with the same problem will receive in either the province of Manitoba or Alberta.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — They are receiving all they can get in Manitoba.

Mr. Barrie: — I have the formulas here from the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Alberta and from the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. I do not wish to take the time tonight to go into them. They're very short, indeed, the one of the Province of Alberta in particular, but I want just to read another news item from the Leader-Post, the issue of December 17th last, and this is what the Alberta Agriculture Minister, Mr. L.C. Halmrast had to say about Saskatchewan farmers receiving less than those in similar circumstances in Manitoba and Alberta. I quote from this press clipping:

“Alberta Agriculture Minister L.C. Halmrast said Wednesday night that the method used by Saskatchewan to give farmers compensation for crops that are unharvested because of the early snow-falls, is nothing more than straight relief.”

“He told the Annual Meeting of the Alberta Federation of Agriculture that farmers in Saskatchewan are getting less than Manitoba and Alberta. The three prairie Provinces are to split the cost of grants fifty-fifty with the Federal Government, but Mr. Halmrast said the Saskatchewan Government is using a different basis of determining the amount of compensation than does either the province of Alberta or Manitoba.”

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I have a letter in my hand from the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta, and I will read it to the hon. member to put the record straight, if you will permit me.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is to inform the hon. member that the Minister of Agriculture for Alberta informed me that that statement wasn't correct, and that he didn't . . .

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There is a letter here to prove it.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — And I want to say while I am on my feet.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Loptson: — The member for Pelly hasn't finished the article yet.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Loptson: — You'll have to let him finish the article, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Will the hon. member continue.

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I don't see anything too wrong with the statement from my study of the three plans that I have here.

Premier Douglas: — On a question of privilege. It is not that the hon. member thinks there is anything wrong with it or not, but the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has a letter from the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta denying the statements and saying they are not correct. The hon. member must either accept his statement or give him time to put it on the record.

Mr. Speaker: — Order! My understanding is the hon. Minister for Agriculture had made his point, that he had made it clear that he had the denial of the Minister of Agriculture from Alberta. I was only telling him to order, but he said 'while I am on my feet' he was going to proceed with something else.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mr. Danielson: — Sit down!

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — I know the hon. member wouldn't want to have the House misinformed. I informed the House yesterday, I think, that the average payment was around . . .

Hon. Members: — Order! Order!

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Gardiner: — You forgot to tell . . .

Mr. Danielson: — Why didn't you tell us that before . . .

Mr. Barrie: — In the province of Saskatchewan, it can be as low as 20 cents an acre, and up to \$3 an acre. That couldn't happen in the province of Manitoba or Alberta, according to their particular formulas.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — From \$2 to \$3 an acre . . .

Mr. Barrie: — Yes, from \$2 to \$3, but yours is . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order! I must ask the hon. members not to carry on a conversation back and forward across the House. The hon. member from Pelly should carry on.

Mr. Barrie: — But in the province of Saskatchewan it is from \$3 an acre down to 20 cents an acre, according to your formula, but not in the province of Manitoba, nor the province of Alberta. But what I would like to point out again is that these people are the people who we have always heard were great friends of the farmers. I would imagine the farmers will be the people who will judge in this province, as to what friends they have, when with one set-back in one year, it seems to me that the formula which was drawn up and submitted to the Federal Government in this province, was designed for one purpose only, and that was to keep the payments to the farm people of this province at the lowest minimum possible.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — May I ask the hon. member a question?

Opposition Members: — No, No.

Mr. Speaker: — The hon. member who is on his feet will decide whether or not he accepts or rejects a question.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — All I want is the reference regarding the clipping of the Minister of Agriculture in Alberta. What paper was that, and the date please. I omitted to get that.

Mr. Barrie: — Well, the Minister of Agriculture says it is not correct; but it is 'The Leader-Post' (C.P.) Calgary, dated the 17th day of December, 1959.

Premier Douglas: — Could I ask the hon. member if the Minister mentioned how much the payments would be to farmers in Alberta?

February 23, 1960

Mr. Barrie: — I'm sorry, I can't . . .

I believe that this Government has failed in one of the first tests that it has had, even after having been in office during the most prosperous period that the people and the province itself has experienced in its history. Insofar as this emergency is concerned, if it had gone on for some years, repetition year after year, then I would say that if all other expenditures were cut to the core, they would be concerned with what the cost of this particular program was going to be in relation to the reduction of other services. It seems to me, had the Federal Government borne the burden as they would like it to have done, we certainly would have heard great rumblings and great noise of it being very inadequate. Be that as it may, the farm people are in the position, and have this emergency to judge just how far the friends of the farmer Government on your right, Mr. Speaker, consider them in drawing up formulas and taking into consideration the help they are going to give.

I want to turn to something else just now. We have heard a great deal about marriages and weddings here, and bankruptcy, and so on. As a matter of fact our friends on the opposite side seem to have an obsession with the word 'bankrupt', and they would have everybody else bankrupt. But I believe that certain records would show that their party, and some of the outstanding men in their party, admit that they are bankrupt. I believe, that this wedding is something that possibly the public in this province is entitled to a little further explanation on in view of a pending election, from the people on the Government side of the House.

When the Premier himself speaking at a C.C.F. Meeting in the city of Montreal two years ago, is reported to have said that unless something like this amalgamation of this new party took place, the C.C.F. would be fated to continue to wander in the wilderness.

Premier Douglas: — Wandering little boy!

Mr. Barrie: — I think the Premier of this province is a gentleman; that is pretty factual. I listened to a statement which he made at that time. You people over there take such great pride in the C.C.F. and your political organization, and so on. It is a very peculiar thing that the Premier of this province and your provincial leader will say you are wandering in the wilderness. It is not only the Premier of this province. Here is another clipping from the 'Winnipeg Tribune', where one of the leading lights in the C.C.F. movement for many years, Mr. Stanley Knowles of Winnipeg said: "The C.C.F. is past the point of no return." He said they must join the new party, or stagnate. Well, I think they are getting very desperate. I believe that possibly the C.C.F. members here, who are now C.C.F. members, possibly don't know any more than we do what they are going to be six months hence.

Premier Douglas: — They'll be C.C.F. members!

Mr. Barrie: — Well, according to rumours at the top, I doubt if they will be C.C.F.

Premier Douglas: — You needn't have any doubt.

Mr. Barrie: — In any case, this play for labour apparently from the leaders of the party in their public statements is one that is going to try to revive their party, financially and numerically, by getting the labour people throughout Canada. I am a man who believes in organized labour. I myself have belonged to labour unions, and my parents and grandparents belonged to unions in this country . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I'm sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it is my duty at this time to put the question on the amendment, pursuant to subsection (3) of Standing Order 30.

Premier Douglas: — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that will not prevent the hon. member from going on to speak on the motion after the vote is taken?

Mr. Speaker: — He may speak after the vote is taken, yes.

The question being put on the amendment, it was negatived on the following recorded division, 31 to 15.

The debate continuing on the proposed motion of Mr. Thorson, seconded by Mr. Thibault:

Mr. Barrie: — I hope we don't have another interruption, Mr. Speaker. I would have tried to wind up by 9:30, but I believe that insofar as the amalgamation of the new party, (the Premier says the name will be the same) . . .

Premier Douglas: — It will be the same in this province.

Mr. Barrie: — This is going to be a freak — it's a freak now, and it is going to be a greater freak, I suppose, after they set up the National Party. Nevertheless, while I agree with organized labour, I would say to them and all other organizations of public people, such as the Wheat Pool, and the Farmers' Union (probably I am not an authority), that they are very foolish to join any particular political party. I believe they will find the success they hope to gain from this fusion will not accrue when it is consummated, because I believe you will find as there are people of different religions, people of different racial and national origins in labour unions, there are people of different political faiths as well, and they will remain there. To suggest that the labour unions or organized labour could force or compel any member to subscribe to a party that didn't have the philosophy that he believed in, I think, would be something we would need a Bill of Rights for.

Premier Douglas: — Nobody suggested it.

Mr. Barrie: — I notice this has been discussed in various articles I have read, where some of the people on both sides of the two parties who are considering joining up, say there will be no such thing; that it will be a freedom of choice. Others differ. But nevertheless, I wish our friends well. We have heard a great deal about allowing the people to decide. I think when the time comes, the people of this province will decide whether a political class party is something that is desirable in this province or not.

I want to make reference for just a few minutes to an incident which I consider is most distressing and alarming that happened in this House. The revelations that were brought forward here in the last few days of the debate is something that I was personally astounded with. The reason for that, insofar as I am personally concerned, is the weak reason given by the Minister of the Crown, who discharged this particular individual. In this province we have, and I am certain there are members representing constituencies on the other side of the House, that have had and will continue to have a Metis problem in their particular constituency. I think all members of this Legislature will agree that, down through the years, and for some years, we have had a very serious problem that confronted municipal governments and Provincial Governments, in connection with these people. The factual evidence which was produced here, the only thing I have to judge by, the documented evidence which was brought down in this particular case, indicated to me this particular gentleman had done a very fine job in his particular management of the Lacerte Co-op Farm. I am very sorry to think that a man who has dedicated his life to this kind of work, would be discouraged, or at the least, diverted from this particular kind of work, by the Government of this province, because this man has apparently made a success, made progress with these people. I am sure the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) and the member for Touchwood (Mr. Meakes) are people who have these problems in their constituencies, and would welcome assistance and would welcome progress made with these people, such as apparently was made in the district of Willowbunch.

What concerned me more than any one thing in connection with what was revealed in this House, is the fact that the people of that community — not the Metis themselves, but the people of the town of Willowbunch and people who know and realize, possibly better than anyone else, the merits of the services rendered by this particular gentleman. I cannot conceive of the Minister of Social Welfare expecting myself or any other member to agree with the only reason this man's discharge after operating and doing such a good job, should suddenly be that he was found lacking in management qualities. I am afraid there is some other basic reason . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — You'd better find out.

Opposition Member: — I think we know.

Mr. Barrie: — I think there must be something more serious than that to have this man discharged. If there is, then I think it should be divulged by the Minister of Social Welfare, and if there isn't anything more than that, there must be some other reason that he has, or some member of his staff has, for the discharge of this particular person. This is a matter that is very disturbing, to see an individual kicked out, with such a scant mount of information given for severing him from that particular duty. I am wondering whether there is something political behind the whole thing; whether there is something behind the scene whereby this man was able to take a hold of a certain group of individuals in the Co-op and probably in time, very soon, be able to place these people in an independent position, where they wouldn't be under the control of the Provincial Government, or officials of the Government, whether possibly that wasn't wanted. I heard state farms mentioned, and such like. I am wondering, too, (and I have every reason to have these doubts in my mind from the scant explanation given by the Minister) that the fact that this man is a cleric would have anything to do with his discharge.

Premier Douglas: — Shame!

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Withdraw it — cheap! cheap!

Mr. Barrie: — I have every reason to have those doubts in my mind.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — What are you hollering about, then?

Mr. Barrie: — I am very sorry that any such thing took place in this province, Mr. Speaker, because these are the kind of men I would say we need many of, to go into the north country, to go into many of the constituencies throughout the province where these Metis people are living, and if he could accomplish what, apparently from the records he has accomplished in this particular farm, then he should be an example and a model for other employees, to do the same kind of work. That is why I say this is distressing and alarming. The one regret I have, when I learned of this the other day from the (I guess I could use the word expose) that was made in the House, from a very well-documented file, most of the documents in that file being letters from the departments of Government. I think possibly the sad part of the whole thing is that something couldn't have been done, and wasn't done in the early stages.

I must say that some of the reasons that confirm some of the matters which I have in mind is when the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) saw fit, and I know it is a difficult thing for him to do, to stand up in this Legislature and criticize and condemn certain officials, certain departments of the Government for certain red tape, and such like. I quite agree that he didn't condemn all civil servants, but when he has reason, as a member of the Government side, to stand up in this Legislature and even make the charges or observations that he did, then one begins to wonder just to what extent this goes.

February 23, 1960

Mr. Speaker, I intended to deal with one or two other items, but I see the hour is getting late. I want to make one further observation before I take my seat. That is, it has always been bewildering and amazing to me, ever since I came into this Legislature, that with all the supposed benefits of being a resident of Saskatchewan, and I agree we have many advantages — with the wealth of resources which we have in this province, that we are not plagued with an influx of people not only from all over Canada, but from outside of Canada as well.

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — Well, we were.

Premier Douglas: — They want to see the Museum!

Mr. Barrie: — This, from the story we have been told by the members of the Government, and the pictures painted, would certainly, in all normal conditions, mean that we would have people pouring in here from all over to take advantage of our cheap insurance rates, our hospitalization plans, which I am not finding fault with. But there must be some reason, because the records indicate that is not the case. There must be some very valid reason for it. We have a wealth of Natural resources; we have . . .

Hon. Mr. Nollet: — It's the climate!

Mr. Barrie: — The hon. member for Cutknife says it's the climate. You may be right, but I am inclined, Mr. Speaker, to believe and agree with the member for Melville when he said this afternoon that his idea of the reason for this situation in our province was the Government sitting across the way.

Opposition Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. Barrie: — Mr. Speaker, I don't know what position I am in at the present time. I am a novice here. There has been a vote taken in the House and I voted for the amendment. I didn't have the opportunity to tell the House before what I was going to do, so if I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I will now resume my seat, but I certainly will not support the motion.

Mr. A. Lopton (Saltcoats): — Mr. Speaker, there isn't much time for me to go into detail. They were going to give me five minutes but now I have split the time with my hon. friend who is on the vanishing list as I am, as far as the Legislature is concerned, so I have to cut that five minutes in two, as the member from Bengough (Mr. A.L.S. Brown) wants to have a few words to say.

I am not going to go into any details. First of all, I wish to express my congratulations to the speakers who have spoken here before. I think probably they have done better this Session, particularly on our side of the House, than I have seen in former Sessions, and I want to

give credit for some on the other side of the House. There are matters which have been debated, things which have been said by both sides of the House which I think I could some way clarify, and take exception to, particularly by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but just imagine me doing that in ten minutes. So I will have to ask your indulgence to permit me to take up some of those matters when I speak on the Budget.

I have heard a great deal of wailing on the Government side over this terrible catastrophe which has happened in the province of Saskatchewan, by virtue of a few acres that got buried under the snow this fall. From listening to the Minister, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, you would think the Province had gone bankrupt.

Mr. McDonald: — Bankrupt of ideas!

Mr. Lopton: — All the monetary sum, as I understand it, is a matter of \$1 million. We have heard also from the Minister about the meagre amount that was spent by former governments, as compared with them, which I want to say is no credit to them because they have to get the money for the people in order to spend it. Without going further into the source of their collections, I want to say that they wouldn't be here, if it wasn't for the tax rental agreement that came from Ottawa by virtue of the Liberal Government that consummated that system.

If they had to collect all the money they have spent from the people directly, they would have been out of the door — out of this Legislature in the election of 1948. Now I wish to compare the inactivity with that of the former government. I am probably the only one in this Legislature who was here during the seven years of drouth, from 1931 until 1938 inclusive. I can probably give you a better picture than other people can, and I want to give you a little picture of what happened, following the drouth of 1937, which was referred to by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Wolseley (Mr. McFarlane) when he spoke. That was the first year that we really had a fodder problem in this province. Previous years, food clothing and fuel had been supplied to almost from one-half to 75 per cent of the people, which amounted to the tens of millions of dollars, and not \$1 million, which my hon. friend is going broke on. To give you a little idea of what the fodder situation was following that dry summer, I want to give you a transcript or a statement which was compiled from the Fodder Division of the Department of Agriculture, of this province. My hon. friend can look it up and see the result.

“Following the drouth of December, 1937, the problem facing the Government in this province was to find fodder enough to keep the livestock alive. It was decided it was necessary to reduce the herds within the dried-out area down to the minimum, and after doing that they found it was necessary to get something in the neighbourhood of one-half a million tons of fodder in order to keep the livestock alive until the spring of 1938.

February 23, 1960

“To find this they had to go far afield. Some of the fodder was obtained as far east as the Province of Quebec, and a lot of it came from the United States. In order to give you an idea of the colossal work entailed in gathering this fodder, the following is a tabulation of the record of the Fodder Division of the Department of Agriculture in this province.”

I am going to read it to you, because it was read in this Legislature during the Session of 1938:

“To begin with, the fodder shipments started sometime in October or the fall of 1937. Up to the 5th day of March, 1938, the Department of Agriculture had shipped into this province directly or indirectly through free freight certificates, about 450,000 tons of fodder. That represented approximately 45,000 tons of fodder. That represented 45,000 carloads or 1,000 trainloads of 45 cars to each train.

“It took approximately 5,100 miles of bales laying end-to-end, or a string of bales from Halifax to Vancouver and half-way back. It would build a stack from Winnipeg, Manitoba, to Swift Current, Saskatchewan, two bales wide and seven and one-half feet high. It has taken 4,500,000 pounds of baling wire; 100 carloads at 45,000 tons to the car. The baling represented 28,125 eight-hour working days with a crew of six men and a power baler.

“In other words, it would have taken 225 power balers, 1,350 men working every working day from the first day of October to the 5th of March to bale this fodder.

“To load this on railway cars, by horse team and men, it would have taken 1100 two-horse teams and 2200 men from the first of October to the 5th of March.

“In order to get this amount of fodder during this period, it was necessary to load on Track 360 carloads every working day from the first of October to the 5th of March. 739 shippers have taken part in providing this fodder; 1125 points received shipment. In addition to this, there have been approximately 5,000 cars loaded of feed grain and distributed — this in addition to providing food, clothing and fodder to 75 per cent of our population.”

Here is what it took for the provision for seed in the spring of 1938:

“Seed wheat supplied \$7 million; seed oats supplied \$8 million; seed barley supplied was \$1 million, oats supplied was \$6 million, or that was \$22 million.

“Tractor fuel supplied for seeding operations was \$1,750,000 — pardon me, \$1,720,000, distributed to 1,500 shipping points. Feed, grain, gas and oil for summerfallow was \$700,000. All in all that spring of 1938, it cost \$24,450,000 — 80,000 farmers were served.”

Then these fellows say they had met a colossal disaster in this province. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how they can belittle themselves.

Mr. Danielson: — . . . in relation to \$56 million.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, that was for human use, but this is only for one season alone. We had seven years of similar conditions, but not quite as disastrous insofar as fodder is concerned. This is all I am going to say, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'm not going to leave him too much time but I hope to give him an opportunity — and I will not support the motion.

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Minister of Mineral Resources): — Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have greatly enjoyed this account from one of the great experienced experts on baled hay.

Mr. Loptson: — Yes, and I'm not a bit ashamed of it.

Mr. Danielson: — You ought to be ashamed of yourself!

Mr. Loptson: — And I will tell my hon. friend, too, that all the cows and horses and sheep got fed then, but there are a few asses still around the country . . .

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

(Debate adjourned)

The Assembly then adjourned at 10:00 o'clock p.m.